An introduction to the New Testament.
225.6 B131i 117924
Bacon, Benjamin Wisner,
Life Pacific College Alumni Library

225.6
B131i

Bacon, Benjamin Wisner, 1860-1932
Introduction to the New
Testament

DATE DUE	BORROWER'S NAME	ROOM NUMBER

225.6
B131i

Bacon, Benjamin Wisner, 1860-1932
Introduction to the New Testament

An introduction to the New Testament.
225.6 B131i 117924

Bacon, Benjamin Wisner,
LIFE Alumni Library

Sydney Strong
Oak Park Ill

1901

10

New Testament Handbooks

EDITED BY

SHAILER MATHEWS

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT

New Testament Handbooks

EDITED BY SHAILER MATHEWS
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A series of volumes presenting briefly and intelligibly the results of the scientific study of the New Testament. Each volume covers its own field, and is intended for the general reader as well as the special student.

Arrangements have been made for the following volumes: —

THE HISTORY OF THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Professor MARVIN R. VINCENT, Union Theological Seminary. [*Ready.*

THE HISTORY OF THE HIGHER CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Professor HENRY S. NASH, Cambridge Divinity School. [*Ready.*

INTRODUCTION TO THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Professor B. WISNER BACON, Yale Divinity School. [*Ready.*

THE HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Professor J. R. S. STERRETT, Amherst College.

THE HISTORY OF NEW TESTAMENT TIMES IN PALESTINE. Professor SHAILER MATHEWS, The University of Chicago. [*Ready.*

THE LIFE OF PAUL. President RUSH RHEES, The University of Rochester.

THE HISTORY OF THE APOSTOLIC AGE. Dr. C. W. VOTAW, The University of Chicago.

THE TEACHING OF JESUS. Professor GEORGE B. STEVENS, Yale Divinity School.

THE BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Professor E. P. GOULD. [*Ready.*

THE TEACHING OF JESUS AND MODERN SOCIAL PROBLEMS. Professor FRANCIS G. PEABODY, Harvard Divinity School.

THE HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE UNTIL EUSEBIUS. Professor J. W. PLATNER, Harvard Divinity School.

AN INTRODUCTION

TO

THE NEW TESTAMENT

BY

BENJAMIN WISNER BACON, D.D.
PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS
IN YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.
1900

All rights reserved

225

COPYRIGHT, 1900,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Norwood Press
J. S. Cushing & Co. — Berwick & Smith
Norwood Mass. U.S.A.

L.I.F.E. College Library
1100 Glendale Blvd.
Los Angeles, Calif. 90026

PREFACE

THE limitations of this volume are imposed by the editor. Even the mere outline, which alone is possible in the narrowly prescribed space, might be made fairly complete if technical terminology, abbreviation, and the presuppositions admissible among experts were allowable. But to be easy and readable in a tenth of the space required and, at the same time, convey a true impression, is difficult. One must watch and pray not to tell half-truths.

Nor can one, even so, be content merely to revamp for a different circle what is familiar to scholars in the great treatises. I have not been deterred from presenting views which are peculiar to myself when these seemed best to set forth the results toward which critical science is tending, by the consciousness that adequate presentation of my reasons is precluded. Scholars will recognise what is new. If valuable, they will adopt it; if disapproved, they will bring it into the arena of debate, where opportunity will be given for completer discussion. In the writings which name their authors, independent study has led me to results more conservative than those of leading critics. Thus the cosmology of Ephesians appears to me essen-

037625

tially Pauline. In the one point wherein the Tübingen critics were nearer to early tradition than most of their present opponents, the Johannine authorship of Revelation, I am compelled by the external evidence, which with them counted for so little, to go their way. Contrariwise, in the anonymous historical books my personal study has led to the conviction that our present gospels and Acts are the outcome of a longer and more complex process of growth than most critics admit. The problems of the Synoptic and Johannine Tradition, more especially that of the special sources of our third gospel and Acts, in connection with theories of the Western Text, defied all attempts at concise statement of accepted results in proper relation to personal conviction. In the dilemma between justice to views which have obtained the sanction of the greatest modern scholars and to the solution which has finally commended itself to me as true, I have thrown myself upon the reviewer's mercy (reviewers are supposed to read prefaces), stating my results, though forced to do so with a baldness painfully suggestive of egotistic self-confidence. Yet I can but hope that some of the departures will be found to be not a going aside from the course of sober criticism, but, to some extent, in advance of it. The aim at least has been to set down nothing as fact which is in conflict with accepted results, nor as probable to which these do not appear to be leading up.

If the attempted unity of impression has been attained, it will be found in a loyal response to the watchword of Harnack, "back to tradition," — or, rather, *through* tradition back to fact. The Tübingen attempt to overleap tradition on the way to the goal has brought a just reaction. No Introduction can fairly reflect the present state of the science which does not illustrate this fact. But the aim is not to learn what was thought in the eighteenth, nor even in the second, century about the New Testament writings and their origin; our goal is the same which criticism from the first has had in view, the facts themselves, only with larger attention than heretofore to *early* tradition as a means. Facts are the divine word, theories the human interpretation. The phenomena of text and tradition are the facts; a new theory will be preferable to the old in proportion as it adjusts itself to these.

Two insertions have been made in the manuscript after delivery, at the editor's request: the logical analyses of the several books, and the appended bibliographies. The analyses, it is hoped, will do more than merely duplicate the synopses of contents which immediately follow, though disproportionate space may thus seem to be given to interpretation. The bibliographies were prepared under peculiar difficulties and are only adapted to the convenience of the reader unfamiliar with other than the English lan-

guage, works in other languages being referred to only in the footnotes. But scarcely more than a selection is made from English works. Reliance must be had on the larger works referred to for full lists of titles.

In conclusion, I owe a debt of thanks to the friends who lent ready assistance when my own ill-health interrupted work upon the book for a period of many months, just as the first proof-sheets were beginning to come. To my colleagues, Professors W. F. Blackman and F. C. Porter, I am especially indebted, above all to Professor Porter, without whose kindness in taking down at dictation from a sick-bed the last chapter of the book, the delays would have been longer, and the faults for which I am fain to ask the reader's indulgence more conspicuous than is now the case. To my father, Dr. L. W. Bacon of Norwich, Ct., I am indebted for the preparation of the Indices and Table of Contents.

The admirable discussion by Wernle, *Die Synoptische Frage*, 1899, published since chapters viii and ix were sent to press, came to hand too late for subsequent employment. Otherwise much labour would have been spared me, and a more finished, and, on secondary points in dispute, in some respects more accurate result presented to the reader.

B. W. B.

CONTENTS

PAGE

PREFACE . . . . . v–viii

PART I

CRITICISM vs. *TRADITION*

CHAPTER I

NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION. HISTORY, METHOD, SCOPE, AND PRESENT STATE OF THE SCIENCE . . 1–25

The term "Introduction," 1. Method of this work, 2. Early attempts, 2. Ancient Introductions, 3. Criticism of the Reformers, 3. Modern discussion, 4. Founders of German criticism, 4. Confusion between science and doctrine, 5. Revolt against modern tradition, 6. Questioning of Pauline and Johannine writings, 6. Of the General Epistles, 7. Of the Synoptic Gospels, 7. Conservative reaction, 9. Progress in Germany, 9. First precise definition of Introduction, 10. A definite scope and method, 10. Strauss and Renan, 11. Historical *vs.* literary criticism, 12. Tübingen, 12. Corrected by Ritschl and Harnack, 14. Four currents of the Apostolic age, 14. Weizsäcker, *et al.*, 15. Extreme positions abandoned, 16. Pauline Epistles, 16. Synoptic Gospels, 17. Resultant views, 18. Three schools of criticism, 19. "Centre," on the Gospels, 19. On the other books, 20. Radicals, 21. Outside of Germany, 22. English criticism, 23. The conservatives, 24. Agreement of all schools in method and scope, 25.

CHAPTER II

PAGE

GROWTH OF TRADITION AND FORMATION OF THE CANON 26–53

External evidence, what? 26. Threefold source of authority in primitive Church, 27. "Scripture" in post-apostolic age, 27. Revelation, 28. Gospel, 29. Early references, 30. Special writings discriminated, 30. Epistles, 31. Gospels and Revelation, 32. Dependence on writings begins, 32. Apostolicity of authorship, 33. Collections of New Testament writings, 34. Canon of Marcion, 34. Ignatius, 35. Polycarp, 35. Barnabas, 36. The Didache, 37. Hermas, 38. Four Gospels distinguished, 38. Justin and Papias, 39. The *Logia* obsolete in Papias's time, 44. His use of other New Testament books, 45. Growing dependence on books, 45. Authority of New Testament books, 46. Justin, Tatian, Irenæus, 47. Clement of Alexandria, 48. Canon of Muratori, 50.

PART II

THE PAULINE EPISTLES

CHAPTER III

THE EPISTLES OF THE FIRST PERIOD: LETTER TO THE GALATIANS AND CORRESPONDENCE WITH THESSALONICA 54–79

Tradition of the priority of the Pauline Epistles, 54. Periods in Paul's literary career, 55. Admitted genuineness of major epistles, 56. GALATIANS the earliest New Testament writing, 57. Its date and occasion, 58. Churches of Galatia in Acts, 58. In the epistle, 59. Paul's opponents, 60. "Jews from Asia"? 61. Analysis, 62. Contents, 63. Coincidence of Luke and Paul, 64. The Jerusalem agreement, 64. Subject to two constructions, 65. Jerusalem "decrees," 67.

PAGE

Paul withstands Peter at Antioch, 68. Separation of brethren, 68. Later rule of the Church, 69. Results of the Galatian crisis, 70.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH THESSALONICA, 71. Analysis of 1 Thessalonians, 72. Of 2 Thessalonians, 72. Occasion of 1 Thessalonians, 73. Doctrinal content, 73. Occasion of 2 Thessalonians, 74. Doctrinal content, 74. Practical content, 75. Genuineness, 75. Apocalyptic ideas of Jesus and of Paul, 76. Antichrist in 2 Thessalonians, 77. Date, 78.

CHAPTER IV

EPISTLES OF THE FIRST PERIOD: CORRESPONDENCE WITH CORINTH, AND LETTER TO ROME . . . 80–105

1 AND 2 CORINTHIANS, 80. Church in Achaia, 81. Date of 1 Corinthians, 82. Events in Corinth, 83. Analysis of 1 Corinthians, 84. Of 2 Corinthians, 86. Factions rebuked in 1 Corinthians, 87. Scandals in the church, 89. Questions submitted: (1) Meats, 90. (2) Decorum in worship, 91. (3) Doctrine of resurrection, 91. Date and occasion of 2 Corinthians, 91. Paul's antagonists, 92. Denunciatory letter, 93. Identified with 2 Corinthians, chapters 10–13, 94. Another fragment, 6:14–7:1, 95.

ROMANS, 95. Analysis, 97. Occasion, character, and content, 98. Paul's gospel, 99. Relation of Jew and Gentile, 100. Conditions at Rome, 101. Chapter 16 a separate letter, 101. Addressed to Ephesus, 103. Verses 25–27 another fragment, 104.

CHAPTER V

EPISTLES OF THE CAPTIVITY 106–126

Paul's silence at Cæsarea, 106. Occasion of Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians, 107. Paul's circumstances, 107. PHILEMON: analysis, 108.

PAGE

EPHESIANS and COLOSSIANS: analysis, 109. Character and object of Ephesians, 111. Christ and his people heirs of the universe, 112. The Colossian heresy, 113. Like conditions at Ephesus, 113. Ephesians, to whom addressed? 114. To Laodiceans, among others, 115. Early accepted, 116. Genuineness, 116. Apocalyptic quotations, 121.

PHILIPPIANS: analysis, 121. Date, 122. Paul's circumstances, 123. Later than end of Acts, 124. Unity? 124. Relation of parts, 125.

CHAPTER VI

SECONDARY CANON OF PAULINE EPISTLES: PASTORAL EPISTLES AND HEBREWS 127–149

Early distinction among Pauline Epistles, 127. Distinction by modern critics, 128. Analysis: 1 and 2 TIMOTHY, 129. TITUS, 130. Contents: 1 Timothy, 130. 2 Timothy, 131. Titus, 131. Historical situation in 2 Timothy, 132. Incompatible elements, 133. Threefold difficulty, 135. Un-Pauline element, 139.

HEBREWS: Early treatment, 140. An independent author, 141. Analysis, 142. Nature and content, 143. To whom addressed? 145. Authorship, 147. Date, 148. Form of Judaism which it opposes, 149.

PART III

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES

CHAPTER VII

1 PETER, JAMES, JUDE, 2 PETER 150–174

Various early canons, 150. 1 Peter not forged, 151. Analysis, 152. Content, 152. Pauline character, 153. Uses Ephesians and Romans, 153. Language, 154.

PAGE

Date and circumstances, 155. Written from Rome, 156. Authenticity, 157.

JAMES: Letter, or homily? 158. Date, 158. Circumstances, 159. Style and language, 160. Analysis, 161. Content, 162. Jewish, or Christian? 163. Relation to Hebrews and Clement, 164.

JUDE and 2 PETER: Analysis, 166. Author of Jude, 166. 2 Peter: pseudonymous, 168. Use of epistles and apocalypses, 168. Date and object, 168. Gnostics opposed, 169. 2 Peter posterior, 170. Contrast with 1 Peter, 172. Late date, 173.

PART IV

THE HISTORICAL BOOKS

CHAPTER VIII

THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION 175–194

Biblical history anonymous, 175. Fourth Gospel stands apart, 176. Interrelation of the three Synoptics, 177. Material in common, 179. How explained, 180. Material peculiar to each, 181. Analysis of historical books: Mark, 183. Matthew, 184. Luke, 184. Acts, 185. Priority of Mark, 187. Two-document theory confirmed, 188. Order of events not chronological, 189. First, *Logia;* then, Mark's narrative, 192.

CHAPTER IX

THE SYNOPTIC WRITERS 195–229

Vicissitudes of MATTHEW, 195. Aramaic original, 196. Character and date, 197. Relation to our Matthew, 198. Our Matthew late, 199. Elements from *Logia*, 200. Final recast, 202.

MARK: Author and place, 203. Primitive criti-

PAGE

cism, 205. Traits of eye-witness, 206. Traits of compilation, 207. Omissions of *logia*, 209.

LUKE — ACTS: Traditional authorship, 211. Use of "Diary," 212. Hebraistic elements, 213. Elements not from Diary, 215. Author's qualifications, 217. Design of twofold work, 218. Peculiar material, 219. Earlier source, 223. "Interpolations," greater and less, 223.

ACTS: Composition, 225. Duplications, 226. Speeches, 227. The Diary, 228. Date, 229.

PART V

THE JOHANNINE WRITINGS

CHAPTER X

THE APOCALYPSE AND THE EPISTLES . . . 230–250

Place of origin, 230. Only one John of Ephesus, 231. Apocalyptic literature, 232. In the church, 233.

REVELATION: Analysis, 234. Unity, 235. Assertion of authorship, 236. Apostolic title not claimed, 237. Dissimilarity to Gospel and Epistles, 238. Independent writer using prior materials, 239. Questioned after 300 A.D., 240. Primeval tradition confirmed, 241. Indications of late date, 242.

1 JOHN: Analysis, 244. Design, 245. 2 John and 3 John: Analysis, 246. Authorship, 246.

CHAPTER XI

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN 251–279

Nature of the book and tradition of its origin, 251. State of the problem, 252. Analysis, 253. Design, 254. Against Gnostic-baptists, 254. Appeals to (1) teach-

PAGE

ing of the Spirit; (2) historic traditions, 256. The discourses, 257. Unhistorical, related to cycle of Jewish feasts, 258. Based on genuine *logia*, 259. And on historical data, 260. Call to Messiahship and function of the Baptist, 261. The seven "signs," 262. Anachronisms and relation to Synoptics, 263. Points of historical superiority, 264. Supplements synoptic tradition, 265. Corrects date of crucifixion, 266. In agreement with Paul, 267. Main source of Gospel, 268. Three contributors distinguishable, 270. (1) Son of Zebedee; (2) presbyter of Ephesus; (3) redactor, 271. Displacements by R., 272. In what sense Johannine, 274. Date, 276.

Summary: (1) The named books, 277. (2) The anonymous books, 278. Tradition *vs.* criticism, 278.

TABLE OF APPROXIMATE DATES 280

INDEX 281

AN

INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

PART I

CRITICISM *vs.* TRADITION

CHAPTER I

NEW TESTAMENT INTRODUCTION. HISTORY, METHOD, SCOPE, AND PRESENT STATE OF THE SCIENCE

The term "Introduction."

Schleiermacher illustrates the special use of the term "Introduction" by referring to its common use, particularly in modern editions of ancient works. A modern book may often dispense with an introduction, but with lapse of time it becomes increasingly needful to supply that indispensable element of knowledge common to author and readers, which in ordinary circumstances may be tacitly presupposed. Thus, Demosthenes's oration *On the Crown* would be unintelligible to us without an explanation of the historical circumstances, the requirements of Athenian law, the policy of Philip and Alexander of Macedon, the relation of Demosthenes to his client Ctesiphon, his own public career and that of his antagonist Æschines. Recently the public have become familiar with books and fragments unexpectedly recovered from ancient libraries, or the sands of Egypt, such as the *Teaching*

of the Twelve Apostles[1] or the so-called *Gospel of Peter* What meaning could they convey without the accompanying historico-literary explanations of experts embodied in an "Introduction"?

Method to be here followed.

With these illustrations in mind, we shall be better prepared to frame our own definition of "Introduction" by reviewing the history of the science.

Familiar assumption has obscured to our minds the fact that most of the New Testament writings really come to us without a title-page, destitute of date or author's name, save such as late, ambiguous, and often contradictory tradition has supplied. Some lack beginning (Hebrews), or ending (Mark). The letters of Paul, fortunately, are carefully superscribed with the names of author and recipients; but without some idea of the circumstances of the correspondence on both sides, they will be scarcely better understood than the audible half of a telephone conversation, and Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts, Hebrews, 1, 2, and 3 John are anonymous. The natural outgrowth of these conditions has been the science of Introduction.

Earliest traces.

The Authorised Version still retains the attempts of early scribes to furnish the required information in its titles and subscripts, which in the later manuscripts gradually extended to greater and greater length. The beginnings of this accumulation of traditional data can be traced to a period near the middle of the second century, when the Church began to appreciate the special value of "apostolic" writings. Its development is traced in Histories of the Formation of the Canon. Suffice it for the present that by the end of the second century the leading churches of the Empire, east and west, were approximating both a uniform practice as to which writings out of

[1] Referred to hereafter as Διδ.

the mass in circulation were suitable for public reading in the churches, and in justification of the selection a uniform tradition of their origin and history.[1] As the object of the compilers of this tradition was not so much impartial history as the justification of their own list as "apostolic" against rivals, later generations are compelled to estimate and interpret their conclusions in comparison with other authorities and with the books themselves. But the birth of a genuine science was long delayed.

Ancient Introductions.

The admirable *Church History* of Eusebius[2] (A.D. 324) served all the purposes of an Introduction to the New Testament for a millennium, and is still the great thesaurus of information. True, a book entitled *An Introduction to the Holy Scriptures* was written ca. 450 A.D., by a certain Hadrian, which Cassiodorus († ca. 570) enumerates and transcribes together with four similar works written between 380 and 551; but these really treat of methods of exegesis, while mediæval and Catholic writers down to the time of the Reformation give us no more than indiscriminate compilations of tradition from Cassiodorus and the church historians and commentators in defence of the received Canon.

Criticism of the Reformers.

Even Luther, Carlstadt, and Calvin, in debating the genuineness, inspiration, and canonicity of 2 Peter, James, Revelation, and other books, were actuated by a doctrinal rather than a historical interest, and made no systematic attempt to supply the need. It was rather in opposition to the doctrine of an infallible Scripture, developed by the post-Reformation dogmatists as an offset to the infallible hierocracy of Rome, that Richard Simon, priest of the Oratory at

[1] The list adopted at Rome ca. 175 A.D. is given in the fragment discovered by Muratori in 1740. See p. 51.

[2] Referred to as Eus. *Hist.* See the translation with notes by A. C. McGiffert, *Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I, 1890.

Paris († 1712), brought out the first treatise worthy to be called an Introduction.[1]

Modern discussion.

Simon devoted only the first 230 pages out of more than 2000 to problems of Introduction in the modern sense; but besides proving by textual criticism the unauthenticity of Mk. 16 : 9–20, Jn. 7 : 53–8 : 11, 1 Jn. 5 : 7–8, he also discussed such questions of the higher criticism as the dates and order of the Gospels, the purpose of Luke in writing his Gospel, and "ancient opinion, Oriental and Occidental, as to the Pauline authorship and canonicity of Hebrews."

Such free handling of the tradition was, of course, denounced, especially by Protestants. But even Simon's opponents were fain to imitate his attempt at a History of the New Testament, besides borrowing copiously from his material. But the interest was still polemic, still there was insistence on treating the New Testament as a unit, not merely every book of which, but each individual verse and letter, must be what tradition represented, or the whole was religiously worthless.

Founders of German Criticism.

The establishment of the science on a better basis is largely owing to two German theologians, J. D. Michaelis[2] († 1791) and J. S. Semler[3] († 1791). The former undertook to defend the genuineness and credibility of the books rather than their divine inspiration; the latter proved that the Canon was not a mere divine fiat, but the outcome of a process of human selection, providentially guided, indeed, yet so slow and halting that by 200 A.D. it had reached no more than the broad

[1] *Histoire critique du N. T.*, Rotterdam, 1689–95.

[2] *Einleitung in die Göttlichen Schriften des Neuen Bundes*, 1750–1780[4]. The edition of [3] 1777 is the first to treat the entire N. T. (Engl. tr.).

[3] *Abhandlung von freier Untersuchung des Kanons*, 1771–1775 (four parts).

outline of its results, and for centuries thereafter continued in dispute.[1] It was natural to hold that a selection so fallible in character must be reëxamined in its grounds and perhaps altered, as if the function of Introduction were to criticise canonicity.[2]

The limits between science and doctrine obscured.

Here was an unfortunate confusion of the *theological* question of the wisdom of the selection made by the Fathers under providential guidance for the practical purposes of edification, with the *historical* question of the correctness of the theory and tradition of Apostolic authorship on which *they* rested it. The choice is a fact of "natural (*i.e.* divine) selection," which every added century of the Church's experience makes more immutable. The theory was demonstrably false in many particulars and has varied in every age.

Presumptions hard to overcome.

It was long before theologians could see that a defence of the traditional date, origin, and literary character of each New Testament book is a mere encumbrance to the doctrines of inspiration, revelation, and canonicity, obstructing the legitimate inquiry of the historian. Critics were equally slow to see that the discovery that tradition often misrepresents the *mode* of the divine revelation and propagation of the truth is no refutation of the *fact*.

[1] Cf. the admirable statement of Loescher, quoted by Driver, *Introd. to O. T.*, p. 36 : Non uno, quod dicunt, actu ab hominibus, sed paulatim, a Deo, animorum temporumque rectore, productus.

[2] The definition "Criticism of the Canon," meaning investigation of the theory and tradition of Apostolic authorship on which the selection of the canonical books was theoretically based, is practically misleading. The Bible Canon is a finality, a survival of the fittest in a process unalterably complete. But "fitness" in this case was determined far less by the critical opinions of rabbis and Fathers than by the instinct of Synagogue and Church, retaining in use books found practically to embody the faith, a long-deferred, fully enlightened verdict of the people, whose voice *thus* uttered is the voice of God.

Revolt against modern tradition.

Michaelis undertook to defend the genuineness of every New Testament book, but had admitted the task to be "difficult" in the case of Jude. The spirit of revolt against a modern tradition whose dogmas encroached upon foreign ground soon proved that there would be "difficulty" in other and much graver cases. The early years of our century are signalised by an outburst of debate not merely reviving the disputes of the first three centuries, but soon calling in question the authenticity of the hitherto unquestioned. In most cases the debate is still open, in few only can it be said to be approaching settlement to-day.[1]

Results. The Pauline and Johannine writings.

Ancient tradition had been practically unanimous in accepting all the epistles which profess to be from Paul. The Pastoral Epistles were now disputed, not so much because of their rejection by Marcion (140 A.D.), as on internal grounds. 2 Thessalonians followed suit. John and 1 John had been traditionally attributed since ca. 175 A.D. to the Apostle, with all but unanimous consent.[2] Bretschneider[3] now brought against these a criticism of such weight that while its own author quailed and retracted before the storm of protest aroused, the question of the authorship of the "Johan-

[1] Of authors whose Introductions followed that of Michaelis only H. K. A Hänlein (*Handbuch der Einleitung in die Schriften des N. T.*, 1794–1800, [2] 1801–1809 — Abstract, 1802) and J. E. C. Schmidt (*Historisch-kritische Einleitung in d. N. T.* 1804–1805, [3] 1818) need be mentioned. The latter was first to question the authenticity of 2 Thess. and the Pastoral Epistles. Schleiermacher followed, casting the weight of his great influence against 1 Tim., but failing to appreciate its solidarity with 2 Tim. and Tit.

[2] An unimportant sect represented by Caius of Rome (180–235), called Alogi by Epiphanius, had rejected the Johannine writings on grounds as arbitrary as Marcion's.

[3] *Probabilia de Evangelii et Epistolarum Joannis Apostoli Indole et Origine*, 1820.

nine" writings remains to this day the most open as well as the most difficult of New Testament criticism.

The General Epistles.

Needless to say that since Simon's day an ever increasing number of scholars agree with the verdict of Origen (230 A.D.) as to Hebrews, "God only knows who wrote it;" moderns adding, however, that Paul certainly did not. James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 John, 3 John, Revelation, the disputed books of antiquity,[1] were of course widely denied to their ostensible or reputed authors. Even 1 Peter, hitherto undisputed, was admitted by Semler and Eichhorn (1818) as Petrine only in an indirect sense. The state of the science during this period is clearly shown in the Introductions of two great German scholars, J. G. Eichhorn,[2] already named, and W. M. L. de Wette.

The Synoptic Gospels.

Eichhorn applied a too undisciplined conjecture to the problem, but rendered his most real service in formulating into a definite theory the fruits of earlier discussion of the curious combination of identity and dissimilarity between Matthew, Mark, and Luke, known as "Synoptic" Gospels from their common point of view. Twenty years before, Storr, Koppe, and Michaelis had attacked this problem from the standpoint of the historian of literature rather than the hitherto sovereign harmonist. Augustine (396 A.D.) had, indeed, offered an explanation, holding in his treatise *On the Agreement of the Evangelists* (I, 2, 4, 12), that "Mark merely followed in the footsteps of Matthew, abridging his Gospel." This theory of dependence on the part of one evangelist on the other was now applied in various orders, and Griesbach[3] supplemented it by suggested

[1] So Eus. *Hist.*, III, 25, 1, following Origen (*Ibid.*, vi., 25, 3–14). Eusebius personally would have rejected Rev. and 2 Pet.

[2] *Einleitung in d. N. T.*, 1804–27 (five volumes).

[3] *Commentatio qua Marci Evang. totum e Matthæi et Lucæ Commentariis descriptum esse monstratur*, 1789–90.

combination: Mark had made a somewhat servile abstract of Matthew and Luke. But Eichhorn became the founder of modern Gospel criticism by showing that the coincidences and differences antedate our present writers. He advanced the theory of a primitive Gospel employed by all three. This *Urevangelium* theory for twenty years was variously modified and adapted to meet the complicated phenomena.[1]

De Wette.

The great Introduction of all this period, however, was that of W. M. L. de Wette.[2] It was conceived in a truly scientific spirit and shows historical method; but the author's principle, to go no further in affirmation than "the point to which we are led by tangible data," gave it a somewhat negative character. Ephesians, already questioned by Schleiermacher, De Wette pronounced "a verbose amplification" of Colossians, and at first[3] confirmed the doubts already expressed by Schmidt (*op. cit.*) against 2 Thessalonians. With Schmidt, Eichhorn, and Bretschneider he would add to the "disputed" books of antiquity the Pastoral Epistles, 1 Peter, John, and 1 John.

Summary.

Thus in the first third of the century we see the theological world, Catholic and Protestant, not in Germany only, but in Holland, France, England, and even beyond the Atlantic, roused to the consciousness that the reign of tradition as to the origin of the canonical books was imperilled, if not already overthrown.

[1] The Synoptic problem soon became a discipline in itself, whose older history is best summarised in Holtzmann's *Die Synopt. Evang.*, 1863, pp. 15–43. For the subsequent history and present state of the problem see O. Cone, *Gospel-Criticism*, etc., 1891, and articles by Sanday, *Expositor*, IV, iii, and Wendt, *New World*, June, 1895.

[2] *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die Bibel A. und N. T.*, 1826, [5]1848. The edition by Messner and Lünemann ([6]1860) modifies in a spirit of conservatism.

[3] In editions 1–4.

Indeed, the revolt had gone further still. Schleiermacher[1] and Credner[2] had urged the necessity of distinguishing our Matthew from the simple compilation of discourses of the Lord "in Hebrew," to which the oldest tradition bore witness, leaving of undisputed New Testament writings nothing in the strict sense "Apostolic" save eight epistles of Paul.

Conservative reaction.

Again a Roman Catholic scholar came to the rescue. The ablest as well as most brilliant contribution from this branch of the Church down to our own day is that of J. L. Hug[3] (†1846), who skilfully adopted the methods of the new science only to prove how needless were its criticisms of the traditional views. Objections to each and all of the canonical books were plausibly explained away. The evangelists simply made use of one another in the order of the canon. In England Horne's Introduction[4] fulfilled a similar apologetic purpose. Meanwhile Michaelis, Hug, and De Wette were translated into French and English.

Progress in Germany.

But Germany remained the home of the science. Here it was vindicating its right to a place among theological disciplines by definition of its scope and disavowal of a polemic or negative animus. De Wette had conceived his task as a branch of hermeneutics, but confessed at the outset that Introduction "is devoid of any true scientific principle and necessary connection." His work, accordingly, was a mere aggregate of material adapted to the Bible-reader's need of a historical background. Schleiermacher urged a development of the science in this direction, but

[1] *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1832, p. 735.

[2] *Beiträge zur Einleitung in die bibl. Schriften*, 1832–1838, and *Einleitung i. d. N. T.*, 1836.

[3] *Einleitung i. d. Schriften d. N. T.*, Freiburg, 1808, [4]1847.

[4] *An Introd. to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scripture*, 1818, [9]1846.

himself evinced a more historical point of view than his predecessors by adopting a chronological order for his discussion, placing first the Pauline Epistles. In Lücke's preface to the posthumous work,[1] however, Introduction is still defined as "criticism of the Canon."[2] Credner, on the contrary, had defined it as "the history of the New Testament," making the science a branch of the history of literature, though his method was an investigation of the individual books in the order of the printed text. The first to give systematic application to the principle was E. Reuss († 1891), the veteran Biblical scholar of Strassburg.[3] Reuss undertook to relate (1) the origin of the individual writings of the New Testament, according to the order of date which he believed he could determine (Literary History); (2) the account of the union of these books in a sacred collection received in the churches (History of the Formation of the Canon); (3) the account of the preservation and transmission of this collection (History of the Text); (4) its diffusion (History of the Translations), and (5) its interpretation (History of Exegesis).

First precise definition of Introduction.

Thus the science of Introduction was gradually reduced to a definite scope and method. Treated as a branch of ecclesiastical history it escaped the Scylla of mere negative polemic, and the Charybdis of mere apologetic. At the same time it shook off the incubus of indefinite extension into the domains of general hermeneutics, Biblical archæology, philology, geography, general history, with which it had been encumbered. No wonder that Jülicher in his admirable

The science attains a definite scope and method.

[1] *Einleitung i. d. N. T.*, edited by Wolde (*Sämmtliche Werke*, i, 8, 1845).

[2] So even Baur and Holtzmann; but in a different sense.

[3] *Die Gesch. d. heiligen Schriften N. T.*, 1842, [5]1887. English translation published by Houghton and Mifflin.

handbook,[1] treats Reuss's definition as final, declaring Introduction to be "that branch of historical science, in particular of the history of literature, whose subject is the New Testament;" for in the meantime had appeared a noble work of this type, the widely known Introduction of F. Bleek[2] († 1859), not yet wholly free from the digressions of De Wette, but steadily pursuing the historical purpose and method, though with more conservative results. Bleek reluctantly, but decisively, abandoned the identification of our canonical Matthew with the Apostolic *Logia*, and treated 1 Timothy and 2 Peter as unauthentic. Revelation he attributed not to John the Apostle, but to a supposed Ephesian elder of that name. He maintained with vigour and true scientific method the authenticity of the other books.

Jülicher's definition.

The great critical movement inaugurated by Strauss and the Tübingen scholars, which midway in the century shook the theological world to its foundations, has permanently affected the science of Introduction, but not by its specific conclusions. The celebrated author of the mythical theory of New Testament story[3] made no pretensions to have applied the processes of literary or documentary criticism to his sources, for the very reason that he considered his Canons of historical criticism to have already proved them unworthy of the effort. Almost equal neglect characterised his great rival in France.[4] His orthodox opponents generally took the same position from

Strauss and Renan.

[1] *Einleitung i. d. N. T.*, [2]1894, p. 1.

[2] *Einleitung i. d. N. T.*, 1862. Engl. by T. & T. Clark, 1883. The third and fourth German editions by W. Mangold (1875, 1886) are adapted by footnotes to the advance of the science. These often contradict the text.

[3] *Das Leben Jesu*, D. F. Strauss, 1835 (Engl. transl.).

[4] *Vie de Jésus*, E. Renan, 1863, [13]1882 (Engl. transl.).

the opposite motive, to their own great detriment. The Tübingen School, founded by F. C. Baur, was also a school of historical rather than literary criticism, but not so oblivious of the need for a basis in scientific analysis of the documents. The Synoptic writings became, accordingly, the special field of debate, but results were almost wholly vitiated by undue haste to apply a special theory of the progress of events, making use of negative results already attained in behalf of this theory, and employing it in turn against some of the few remaining undisputed sources. Doubtless it was time that historical criticism should endeavour to draw from even crudely classified materials a more consistent picture of the age which gave them birth. Early Christian literature, inside and outside the Canon, is the precipitate of a great movement of religious thought, and must be studied as the product of definite currents of human opinion in a continuous process. Theoretically, therefore, the result should serve to interpret church tradition as embodied in its canon. Practically Baur and his adherents were as overconfident in their reconstruction of history as their dogmatic opponents, and they used it as if bent on destroying tradition rather than interpreting it. Nevertheless, the attempt to bring the somewhat vague, disconnected, and negative results of literary criticism into definite relations with historical processes was salutary. Baur wrote no Introduction, nor did any of his earlier followers. Only a deeply and wisely modified remnant of Tübingen views remains in its one great Introduction by A. Hilgenfeld of Jena.[1] But the discussions of special topics by Baur, Zeller, and Schwegler[2] revolutionised the methods of the science.

Historical *vs.* literary criticism.

Tübingen's influence upon Introduction.

[1] *Einleitung i. d. N. T.*, 1875.

[2] See in particular by Baur: *Die Christuspartei in Korinth*

The Tübingen theory.

The fulcrum for the whole theory was found in the greater Pauline Epistles, whose genuineness had never been questioned, and whose internal character might well be assumed to make suspicion forever impossible. As contemporary letters these threw an unintended and thus more trustworthy light upon the period. Its dominant feature seemed to be the struggle of infant Christianity to free itself from the swaddling bands of Judaism. The echoes of this great struggle are still audible at the close of the second century, when literature becomes fairly abundant. Midway of the century stands Marcion, champion of an extreme Paulinism, rejecting all Scripture save ten epistles of Paul and the Gospel of Luke. A decade or two later were placed the Clementine Homilies and Recognitions, supposedly representing an extreme form of Judaistic heresy and attacking Paul under the guise of Simon Magus. Writers of this period show that the great body of the Church had come meantime to occupy a mediate, though not altogether consistent, position, from which extremists on both sides were excluded as heretics. What more natural than to find here evidences of a historical progress of Hegelian type, from the antagonism of Jewish (Petrine) against Gentile (Pauline) Christianity to the higher unity of the Catholic Christianity of Justin Martyr and Irenæus, and in the stages of advance the touchstone and key to the New Testament writings? The historical setting of each would

in the *Tüb. Zts. f. Th.*, 1831; *Paulus der Apostel &c.*, 1845, [2]1866 (English); *Kritische Untersuchungen über d. Kan. Evang.*, 1847; and for a comprehensive view, *Kirchengeschichte der drei ersten Jahrhunderte*, 1853.

Zeller's contributions as editor of the *Theol. Jahrb.* extend from 1842 to 1857. His *Apostelgeschichte*, 1854, appeared in English in 1875, and has value.

Schwegler set forth the theory comprehensively in his *Das nachapost. Zeitalter*, 1846.

be revealed by its animus or "tendency," whether polemic or conciliatory.

Tübingen views of the history corrected.

The church historians of more recent times, Ritschl[1] and Harnack,[2] have taught us that Baur's supposedly dominant issue of early Christianity had already ceased to be dominant by 70 A.D., when the last claims of Jerusalem to be the centre of Christendom forever disappeared. Thus Paul himself may well have witnessed, if he did not personally effect, the great reconciliation for which in Rom. 15: 30–33 we see him risking his life (cf. Acts 20: 22–24). Not two but four principal currents of thought must be distinguished in the later Apostolic age, whose tendencies are thus classified by Harnack: (1) The Gospel has to do with the people of Israel, and with the Gentile world only on the condition that believers attach themselves to the people of Israel (particularism and legalism, in practice and in principle, which, however, was not to cripple the obligation to prosecute the work of Missions). (2) The Gospel has to do with Jews and Gentiles: the first, as believers in Christ, are under obligation as before to observe the Law, the latter are not (universalism in principle, particularism in practice). (3) The Gospel has to do with both Jews and Gentiles: no one is any longer under obligation to observe the Law; for the Law is abolished, and the salvation procured by Christ's death is appropriated by faith. The Old Testament in its literal sense is of divine origin, but was intended from the first only for a definite epoch of history (Paulinism: universalism in principle and in practice; temporary validity of the whole Law.) (4) The Gospel has to do with Jews and Gentiles: no one need, there-

Harnack's four currents of the Apostolic Age.

[1] *Entstehung der altcath. Kirche*, [2] 1857 (Engl. transl.).

[2] *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 1888–[3] 94. Engl. 1895. *Chronologie d. altchristl. Literatur*, 1897.

fore, be under obligation to observe the ceremonial commandments and sacrificial worship, because these commandments themselves are only the wrappings of moral and spiritual commandments which the Gospel exhibits in the perfect form (universalism in principle and in practice in virtue of a neutralising of the distinction between Law and Gospel, old and new. The Law never had validity save in a spiritualised and universalised interpretation).[1]

Later representatives of the school.

For the sober second thought of the school of Baur, corrected by church historians within and without the pale, we must look to the brilliant work of C. Weizsäcker[2] both as a literary and historical critic. For it was in the field of Introduction that retractation was most imperative and complete. The "tendency" which Tübingen critics found so clearly marked in Gospels, Epistles, and Apocalypse, and by which they undertook wholly to supersede tradition, is now acknowledged to have been almost wholly fanciful. Rig-

Weizsäcker.

[1] Abridged from Harnack, *Hist. of Dogma* (Engl.), Vol. I, ch. ii, Supplement 2. Of these four tendencies only (2) and (3) are directly represented in the N. T. (1) is the view of the Judaisers, overcome by the common opposition of Paul, James, and the older Apostles. (2) is the view taken by James and the older Apostles, and is the basic idea of the Synoptic writers and Rev. In practice it met the difficulty of finding a *modus vivendi* between Jewish and Gentile Christians (Acts 15 : 28, 29, Rev. 2 : 14, 20, Διδ. 6 : 3). (3) was at first accepted by Peter as well as Paul (Gal. 2 : 11 *sq.*). The breach at Antioch was caused by Peter's reaction to (2) under the influence of "certain from James." (4) may be called Hellenism or Alexandrianism, and found points of connection with pre-Christian attempts to universalise Judaism. Apollos would seem to be its N. T. representative. Elements of Acts (ch. 7), Heb. and Jn. are affected by it, as the Synoptics and Rev. have elements that still show traces of (1).

[2] *Das apost. Zeitalter d. christl. Kirche*, 1886, [2]1892 (Engl. transl. *The Apostolic Age*).

Extreme, but now abandoned, positions of Baur.

orous application of the theory led Baur to outdo the scepticism of Schmidt, Bretschneider, and De Wette. Only Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, and Galatians were left as authentic Pauline Epistles, the other six in his judgment reflecting various phases of the struggle against Gnosticism, which followed after the Petro-Pauline controversy. Matthew and Luke exhibited traces of more than one superimposed type of doctrine, but that of Mark was latest, a colourless compend of Matthew and Luke of the conciliatory type. Matthew was Petrine, Luke and Acts Pauline, but modified in the interests of conciliation. The Johannine Epistles and Gospel were intelligible only in the age of the second century theologians, when the "Catholic" faith was assuming shape. Only Revelation exhibited the intense and narrow Jewish conservatism of that Apostle who in the compact of Gal. 2 : 9 had classed himself with Peter as an Apostle to the circumcision only. 1 Peter, as deutero-Pauline in character, was necessarily late and unauthentic, James anti-Pauline, but late, Jude and 2 Peter anti-Gnostic, like the Pastoral Epistles.

Their position on questions of Introduction. 1. Pauline Epistles.

The inexorable march of discovery has forced back, by fully half a century, some of the latest dates assigned by the "tendency" critics, while the greatest of Baur's followers have made haste to retract his unjustifiable rejection of the Pauline Epistles not previously questioned. Holsten,[1] it is true, remained rigid to the end in rejecting all but the four, even while his keenly discriminating interpretation of Paulinism[2] effected more than a conciliation between Peter and Paul; but Hilgenfeld,[3] the most distinctive living adherent of

[1] *Zts. f. w. Th.*, 1872, p. 456.

[2] *Evang. d. Paulus u. d. Petrus*, 1867, and *Evang. d. Paulus dargestellt*, Pt. I, 1880, Pt. II (posthumous), 1898.

[3] *Hist.-krit. Einleitung i. d. N. T.*, 1875.

the school, has proved that 1 Thessalonians, Philippians, and Philemon must be by the same author as Galatians and Corinthians, while Weizsäcker, Baur's worthy successor at Tübingen, and O. Pfleiderer,[1] nearest to Holsten of living interpreters of Paul, recede still further toward the pre-Tübingen views, rejecting as un-Pauline only 2 Thessalonians, Ephesians, Colossians(?), and the Pastoral Epistles, and admitting a Pauline basis even here, at least in Ephesians and 2 Timothy.

2. Synoptic Gospels.

Baur's Synoptic theory has not a living adherent, for Volkmar[2] and Pfleiderer follow the prevailing view of the dependence of Matthew and Luke on Mark, dating their proto-Mark in 70–80 A.D., Luke ca. 100–110, Matthew 110–130. Weizsäcker[3] scarcely differs from the views of Holtzmann, and even Hilgenfeld retains only the priority of a proto-Matthew to Mark. Thus in matters of date and authorship criticism reverts to where it was before the rise of the Tübingen School. Says Harnack, "Baur's brilliant attempt to explain 'Catholicism' as a product of the mutual conflict and neutralising of Jewish and Gentile Christianity reckoned with two factors, of which the one had no significance at all, and the other only an indirect effect."[4] The growth of the Church was a progressive Hellenising of Old Testament religion in the Gentile world, but the currents traceable in its literature were many and complex. Of true Jewish Christianity there is no trace in the New Testament save indirectly in Paul

[1] *Das Urchristenthum, seine Schriften u. Lehren*, 1887, and *Der Paulinismus*, 1873, [2]1890 (Engl. transl.).

[2] *Die Evangelien, oder Marcus u. d. Synopsis*, 1870, [2]1876; *Jesus Nazarenus*, 1882. Substantially represented by *Supernatural Religion, an Inquiry*, etc., 1874, [8]1879.

[3] *Evangelische Geschichte*, 1864.

[4] *Hist. of Dogma* (Engl. of Buchanan), I, p. 293.

and the underlying *sources* of Revelation[1] and the Synoptic writers. True Paulinism was also very limited in its direct influence. Almost equally strong is the reaction against the violence of "tendency" theories of forgery.

Resultant views in the history of N. T. literature.

Yet we owe much to Baur. "He has taught us," says Jülicher, "to appreciate the books of the New Testament in a truly historical way, as products of the spirit of Christianity at a definite time and as witnesses for it." In this light we may class them in four great groups, according to their purpose. The beginnings of the literature emanate from the struggle against pure legalistic Judaism, in Paul's day a still threatening though vanquished power. But there is a rapid change of front. In the latest writings the danger is from Gnosticism, a theosophic, eclectic propaganda, which sought to Hellenise Jewish and Christian ideas in systems now ascetic, now antinomian, but always dualistic. Internally the growth of the Church is marked by the growth of a didactic, catechetic literature illustrated in the Synoptic writings, 1 Peter and James, and theologies illustrated in Hebrews and John.

Such are the impressions left in our field from a half century of historical criticism. Harnack rightly welcomes the "retreat all along the line" of the "tendency" critics as a "return to tradition." What should be observed, however, is that the tradition in question is not that of the *eighteenth*, but of the *second*, century; for it is significant that in the same breath he cites as its truest interpreters the Introductions of Jülicher and Holtzmann,[2] the two which, if any, represent the best results of the schools of Bleek and Baur.[3]

[1] Jewish pure and simple in the peculiar view of Harnack.

[2] *Lehrbuch d. hist.-krit Einleitung i. d. N. T.*, 1885, [3]1892.

[3] Reference in *Chron. d. altchr. Lit.*, pp. 8, 10.

A psychological law seems to decree that, in movements of opinion, men shall group themselves into an extreme right of immovable conservatives, a right centre of conservatives capable of advance, a left centre of cautious progressives, and an extreme left of radicals. So in the case of the great wave set in motion by Strauss and Baur. Of the first group we need say nothing, because mere reassertions of tradition have no effect on progress, convincing only those convinced before. Scarcely more than this were the anti-Tübingen replies of Guericke[1] and Hofmann,[2] though Luthardt, Hofmann's pupil, did better work in defence of the Johannine authorship of the fourth Gospel.[3] But Credner, Schleiermacher, and De Wette had successors who learned from the Tübingen School, while refusing to be carried away by its "tendency" theory. Such was the erratic H. Ewald.[4] Such were Reuss, Bleek, and Mangold, already mentioned, with whom we have ventured to class Jülicher as the most liberal of conservatives, though he himself defers to Holtzmann, to whose work, accordingly, we must look as that of the most conservative of liberals. It began with an epoch-making study of the Synoptic problem.

The "centre," "left," and "right" of criticism.

Gieseler's[5] modification of the Urevangelium theory, which substituted an oral Gospel, grown stereotyped by use, for Eichhorn's primitive source, had proved of small service. As little resulted from that of Paulus, Schleiermacher, Lachmann, and H. Ewald, breaking

Position of the "centre" in Gospel criticism.

[1] *Hist.-krit. Einleitung*, 1843, [3]1868, as *N. T. Isagogik.*

[2] *Die h. Schrift d. N. T.*, 1862–86.

[3] *Johanneische Ursprung d. vierten Evang.*, 1874, [2]1876 (Engl. transl.).

[4] *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, Bd. V, 1855, [3]1867; VI, 1858, [3]1868; VII, 1859, [2]1869 (Engl. transl.).

[5] *Hist.-krit. Versuch über d. Entstehung u. d. frühesten Schicksale d. Evang.*, 1818.

up the proto-Gospel into groups of narratives. Apologists persistently seek to magnify the *Logia* as nearly as possible to the dimensions of the present Matthew, and thus make of this a proto-gospel; but critics will not believe in the traceless disappearance of a primitive Apostolic source of the assumed proportions, any more than they can conceive a process for its concoction. Such a thing might well provoke the sweeping scepticism of Strauss. This, however, was met by Weisse[1] and Wilke[2] with an effective documentary criticism, which gave to our canonical Mark its true position as a fundamental source, till Holtzmann,[3] sifting down the multitude of discussions of the problem, and rejecting tendency theories, laid down as the basis of future study the present so-called two-document theory. This recognises in Mark and the *Logia* the chief elements which, in different combination and with the addition of some further material, have been used in the compilation of our Gospels of Matthew and Luke.

And in the other books.

The same mastery of critical method was applied by Holtzmann to the chief problems of Pauline literature,[4] the comprehensive results of criticism being summed up finally in his Introduction already mentioned. Here he places the composition of Mark about 70, Matthew and Luke 90–94 A.D. The names Matthew and Luke he regards as derived from the employment in the one case of the *Logia*, in the other — in Acts — of the journal of Paul's companion. Of the Johannine writings only Revelation might perhaps be attributed to the Apostle as a compilation ca. 95 A.D. of older "prophecies." The Gospel and Epistles

[1] *Die evang. Gesch. kritisch u. philosophisch behandelt*, 1838.
[2] *Der Urevangelist*, etc., 1838.
[3] *Die synopt. Evang.*,1863.
[4] *Kritik der Eph. und Colosserbriefe*, 1872, and *Die Pastoralbriefe*, 1880.

of John are slightly later. Of the Pauline Epistles only 2 Thessalonians is wholly rejected. Colossians and Ephesians are different elaborations of a single Pauline original. Even the Pastoral Epistles contain Pauline elements, especially 2 Timothy, adapted ca. 100 to combat incipient Gnosticism. Hebrews is, of course, deutero-Pauline, 1 Peter is dated under Trajan on account of the type of persecution presupposed. The other Catholic Epistles are dated later still.

The position of Jülicher is still more moderate. He admits 2 Thessalonians and Colossians, while still doubtful of Ephesians, and otherwise follows the more conservative alternatives of Holtzmann.

Radicalism.

But from this significant agreement in matters of Introduction of Ritschlians with the followers of Baur, we must turn to the handful of Dutch and Swiss scholars who have lately sought to atone for what they seem to regard as an abandonment of the Tübingen holy war against tradition by a tendency criticism so extreme as to undermine the very basis of criticism itself. Following the preposterous attempt of Pierson and Naber[1] in Holland to throw doubt upon the historicity of the person of Jesus, as well as the authenticity of all the Pauline Epistles, A. D. Loman[2] undertook to galvanise the long defunct ultra-radicalism of Bruno Bauer[3] († 1882) by an inversion of the Tübingen axiom. The journal of Paul's companion in Acts 16 : 10–18, 20 : 5–17, 21 : 1–18, etc., is made the only contemporary writing of the New Testament.

[1] *Verisimilia:* Laceram conditionem N. T. exemplis illustrarunt et ab origine repetierunt A. Pierson et S. A. Naber, 1886. Wittily refuted by the O. T. critic A. Kuenen in a review in the *Th. Tijdschr.*, entitled "Verisimilia?"

[2] "Quæstiones Paulinæ," *Th. Tijds.*, 1882, 1883, 1886.

[3] *Krit. d. Evang.*, 1850–52; *Apostelgesch.*, 1850; *Krit. d. Paul. Briefe*, 1850–52, *Christus u. d. Caesaren*, 1877.

The discrepancies between this and Paul prove the unauthenticity of all the Epistles in their present form, and the mythical character of the Gospel story! The arguments advanced have most force in the less extravagant writings of R. Steck[1] and D. Völter, who reject, however, only certain parts of the greater Epistles.[2] These views have met such thorough-going refutation, particularly at the hands of Holsten[3] and Clemen,[4] not to speak of conservatives like Gloel[5] and Zahn,[6] and liberals like Holtzmann,[7] that we are constrained to join the great majority of scholars of whom a present leader of the school complains that they treat the theory as unworthy of serious consideration.[8]

Criticism in other lands.

It is to be regretted that on the outskirts of the arena, where criticism encounters a more solidly entrenched traditionalism than in Germany, extreme views are most in evidence. Few, indeed, are the genuine contributions to the simple unpolemic progress of the science from Dutch, French, or English scholars. The anti-supernaturalism of Renan continues in France to give undue importance to questions of historical criticism, making the cautious liberalism of Sabatier[9] exceptional, and setting the more radical criticism of the two Révilles, d'Eichthal, and Havet[10] in mutually

[1] *Der Galaterbrief nach seiner Echtheit untersucht*, etc., 1888.
[2] *Komposition d. Paul. Hauptbriefe*, I, 1890.
[3] Six arts. in *Prot. Kirchenztg*, 1888.
[4] *Einheitlichkeit d. Paul. Briefe*, 1894.
[5] *Jüngste Kritik d. Gal.*, 1890.
[6] *Einleitung*, § 9, 1898.
[7] *Einleitung*, Kp. V, 11, 1892.
[8] *Van Manen*, Paulus I und II, 1891. The complaint is made mainly as to English scholars in *Expos. Times*, September, 1898.
[9] *Essai sur les Sources de la Vie de Jesus, les trois premiers Evangiles et le quatrième*, 1866; *L'apôtre Paul*, [2]1891 (Engl. 1896), and *Apocalypse de St. Jean*, 1888.
[10] See under Synoptic Gospels.

injurious opposition to the scholarly but slowly progressive conservatism of the veteran Godet.[1]

English criticism.

English scholarship, too, has either lacked independent productive power, or been preoccupied by polemic interest. In special departments Conybeare and Howson,[2] Lightfoot, Ezra Abbot,[3] and others have made contributions fully abreast of German scholarship; but general Introductions of independent value are lacking. The polemic of S. Davidson,[4] reproducing extreme Tübingen radicalism, provoked from G. Salmon[5] a learned and brilliant, but equally polemic, reply from the opposite extreme; while popular Introductions, like those of J. R. Lumby,[6] M. Dods,[7] and even the voluminous productions of J. R. Gloag[8] do little more than restate tradition. American historical criticism has its Weizsäcker in A. C. McGiffert,[9] reversing many of the conclusions, though not lowering the scholarly standard of his predecessor,[10]

[1] *Introd. au N. T.*, 1892, 1898 (Engl. transl. of Vol. I, 1894).

[2] *Life and Epistles of St. Paul.* Latest of the many editions, 1894.

[3] See the Commentaries of the former on the Pauline Epistles and the Essays in reply to "Supernatural Religion" on the authorship of the fourth Gospel, reprinted with that of Ezra Abbot on the external evidence, in *The Fourth Gospel*, Abbot, Peabody, and Lightfoot, 1891.

[4] *An Introd. to the Study of the N. T.*, 2 vols., 1868, [3] 1894. The earlier work (3 vols., 1848–51) was conservative.

[5] *A Historical Introd. to the Study of the Books of the N. T.*, 1894.

[6] *A Popular Introd. to the N. T.*, 1883.

[7] *Introd. to the N. T.*, 1889.

[8] Introd. to the *Pauline Epistles*, 1874. To the *Catholic Epistles*, 1887. To the *Johannine Writings*, 1891. To the *Synoptic Gospels*, 1895.

[9] *History of the Apostolic Age*, 1897.

[10] Ph. Schaff, author of *Apostolic Christianity* (Part I of his *History of the Christian Church*) 1882, [5] 1890.

but it rests with the forthcoming work of S. D. F. Salmond[1] to determine whether English Introductions shall transcend the level of apologetics by abiding results independently achieved.

Conservatism.

But we should do injustice to the line of conservative scholars if we failed to recognise the splendid scholarship and industry of German critics such as B. Weiss[2] and Theo. Zahn,[3] whom one hesitates to class as apologetic, so genuine is the purpose, especially of the former, to be free from traditional bias. Such critical research as Weiss's into the origin and sources of the Synoptic writings,[4] proves that scholarly conservatism has ceased to play into the hands of the sceptical historical critic by disdaining scrutiny of the documents, and advances Introduction by showing certain weaknesses of the two-document theory. Something there is also of judicial reserve in the treatment of 2 Peter and the Pastoral Epistles, though it is hard to believe a really unbiassed writer could make 1 Peter the earliest of New Testament writings.[5] Even Zahn, "prince of conservative scholars," while all his magnificent wealth of learning appears enlisted in behalf of the authenticity and integrity of every canonical book, knows no method but the universal method of pure scientific criticism. That he uses it as a master, none will deny; and occasionally, as when he explains the Pauline character of 1 Peter, by transferring an important share in the

[1] To appear in the International Series edited by himself and C. A. Briggs.

[2] *Einleitung i. d. N. T.*, 1886 (Engl. transl.), [3] 1897.

[3] *Einleitung i. d. N. T.*, 2 vols., 1897, 1898.

[4] *Marcus Evangelium*, 1872, and *Matthæus Evang.*, 1876. See also the Introd., § 50, on the Sources of the Acts.

[5] The present views of Weiss on the Pauline Epistles are given in an article in *Am. Journ. of Theol.*, April, 1897.

authorship to Silvanus,[1] he surprises us by the similarity of his results to those of Semler and Eichhorn. But the *Aramaic Matthew*, which Weiss had already expanded into a biography, in Zahn becomes incredibly similar to our Matthew. From this, written 61–66 A.D. and Mark, Luke, who writes his double work 70–75 A.D., has drawn.

Agreement of all schools in method and scope.

With all these differences of judgment, there is nevertheless to-day but one science of Introduction, one method of literary and historical criticism. The perfect balance of evidence in detailed results remains for him who shall be able to join to the amplest scholarship an impartiality of judgment absolute not only in intention, but in fact.[2]

[1] *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 30.

[2] Excellent reviews in English of the history of Introduction, including full bibliography, will be found in the Introductions by B. Weiss and Godet; also much of the outline of Holtzmann's review and bibliography in the *Student's N. T. Handbook*, by M. R. Vincent, 1893, pp. 48–112. The *History of Criticism*, including much of Introduction, is treated in the companion volume of this series by Professor Nash. The *Histories of the Apostolic Age*, by Weizsäcker and McGiffert, are substantially Introductions.

CHAPTER II

GROWTH OF TRADITION AND FORMATION OF THE CANON

What is external evidence?

WRITINGS not altogether ineffective soon impress their mark upon contemporary literature. So of the New Testament books. At first we can only guess at their existence from more or less doubtful traces in other writers of familiarity with their special language or ideas. Later on quotations are made, here and there explicitly and by name, and at last they are referred to as peculiarly authoritative, and this authority is defended by references to their Apostolic origin. Both kinds of use, acknowledged and unacknowledged, are designated "external evidence," though it is evident that mere employment can prove nothing as to authorship but only as to date, and even this on condition that real literary dependence can be shown, and that the evidence of priority be not ambiguous. All kinds of external evidence are wont to be comprehensively and somewhat confusedly treated under the title History of the Canon.[1] We are not now concerned to prove how far back the *existence* of the various New Testament books can be traced by the doubly doubtful evidence of "echoes" and "influences," often cited, even when acknowledged, in inverse directions; but with the much less obscure process by which the Church begins first to

[1] See, *e.g.* Westcott, *Hist. of the Canon of the N. T.*, [6] 1889, and Th. Zahn, *Gesch. d. N. T. Kanons*, 1888–92.

manifest its knowledge of certain writings as Apostolic, and ultimately to recognise and defend a group of such as possessing special authority; *i.e.* the segregation of a Canon and growth of a tradition. This process had reached a finality with regard to nearly all the important writings of the New Testament by 200 A.D.; the later disputes, extending through centuries, as to the delimitation of the list, *i.e.* the question just which, if any, of the minor group of "disputed books" already referred to[1] should be included, we need not consider. The practice of the early Fathers enables us to date with tolerable definiteness the stages of the process by which New Testament writings came gradually to be raised to the authority of "sacred Scripture" on a level with that which the Old Testament had enjoyed from the start.

The threefold source of authority in the primitive Church.

Down to the second Jewish war (135 A.D.) the testimony of the Apostolic Fathers is negative but conclusive. Nowhere is it more fully admitted than by B. Weiss in § 5 of his Introduction, that for this early age there is no New Testament sacred literature, no Canon, no authoritative standard not recognised by the Synagogue as well, save the authoritative teaching of Jesus, and that not as written in specially selected books, but a living tradition, expounded by the Apostles and their official successors in the churches.

"Scripture" in the post-Apostolic age.

For New Testament writers and Apostolic Fathers alike "Scripture" means simply the Old Testament, with considerable latitude in the inclusion of apocryphal material.[2] To both this is "the word of God"

[1] p. 7.

[2] Cf. the use of Wisdom by Paul, Heb., and Clem. Rom.; *Apoc. of Elias* in 1 Cor. 2 : 9 (so Origen) and Eph. 5 : 14 (so Epiphanius); *Ps.-Philo* in Mk. 9 : 13; unknown writings in Lk. 11 : 49, Jn. 7 : 38; *Enoch* in Jd. 14; *Eldat and Modad* in Clem. Rom., 2d Clem. and Hermas, etc.

"inspired of the Holy Ghost," "oracles of God" that "cannot be broken," "oracles of the teaching of God . . . which are true, which were given through the Holy Ghost, wherein nothing unrighteous or counterfeit is written,"[1] precisely as to the rabbis from whom through Paul and the Fathers the Church has taken over its doctrine of inspiration. The difference between Synagogue and Church is simply that whereas the former defers authoritative interpretation to the coming of the "Prophet like unto Moses" who "will tell them all things,"[2] the latter rejoices in the possession not only of the tradition of that complete and perfect interpretation, but of a present "unction from the Holy One" giving absolute understanding of all things (1 Cor. 2:6–16, 1 Jn. 2:20, 27, 5:20). The Church has thus a "threefold source of divine authority." It is to "remember (i) the words which were spoken before by the holy prophets; (ii) the commandment of the Lord and Saviour through the Apostles" (2 Pet. 3:2, cf. Heb. 1:1 f., 2:3), and last but by no means least it has (iii) "the prophetic Spirit."[3] For down to the end of this period the claim of present inspiration is anything but a stereotyped form. Inspiration voices itself officially in the authoritative utterances of the Church (Acts 15:28; cf. Clement of Rome, 93–96 A.D.,[4] "obey . . . the things

Revelation.

[1] Clem. Rom., 45:1, 53:1, 62:3.

[2] Jn. 4:25, cf. 1 Jn. 5:20.

[3] Just. M. *Apol.* I, 6 (150 A.D.): "We [Christians] reverence and bow to God, and to the Son who came from him and taught us these things, and to the prophetic Spirit." Cf. 1:13, 23 and *Dial.* 48, 139. Hegesippus (175 A.D.) appeals to "the Law, the Prophets and the Lord" (Eus. *Hist.*, 4:22, 23). See further the passages cited by Holtzmann, *Einleitung*,[3] p. 106 f.

[4] The dates for the Ap. Fathers are taken from Harnack's *Chronologie*, 1897, p. 718 f. They agree substantially with Lightfoot. Holtzmann dates Clem. Rom., 93–125 A.D.; Von

written by us through the Holy Spirit" the words spoken by Him [God] through us"), individually in the "visions and revelations" of "prophets" (1 Cor. 14:29–32, 2 Cor. 12:1, Acts 15:32, 16:6, 7, 20:23, 21:4, 9–11, Revelation *passim*); for the conviction of early Fathers of their own possession of such gifts of the Spirit is not only every whit as vivid as that of Paul and John, but is expressly acknowledged by the Church.[1]

If even "Scripture" in the New Testament and the early Fathers proves to have been a far less exclusive term than with us, or even with the Roman Church, we need not be surprised that the "commandment of the Lord through the Apostles" was by no means limited to a fixed group of writings, whereas the limitation of "the prophetic Spirit" to documents at all was a difficult matter, still more that of reducing the three most cherished productions of this kind—Revelation, Hermas, and the Apocalypse of Peter — to a single canonical representative.

Gospel.

It never occurs to the early Fathers to say whence they obtain their references to sayings and doings of the Lord. Generally the language most nearly ap-

Soden, 93–120. The letters of Ign. and Polyc. are dated by Holtzmann and Hilgenfeld after 150; but see Zahn, *Gesch. d. Kan.*, and Krüger, *Hist. of Early Christian Lit.*, 1897. The passages cited are from Clem. Rom., 59 and 63.

[1] With Gal. 1:11, 12, cf. Ign. *ad Philad.* 7 (110–117 A.D.). With Rev. 22:6–9, cf. Hermas, *Mand.* 3:1, 2, 4, (140 A.D.). It is with the greatest reluctance that I am constrained to exclude the citation of these passages in full, refuting as they do the baseless notion of a sudden cessation of the consciousness of revelation. The judgment of the early Church appears in Διδ. 11:7 (120–150 A.D.). "Any prophet speaking in the Spirit ye shall not try, neither discern (cf. 1 Cor. 12:10, 14:29) for every sin shall be forgiven, but this sin shall not be forgiven" (cf. Matt. 12:32).

proximates Matthew, less frequently Luke and Mark, sometimes uncanonical Gospels. The readers are expected to know by common tradition whether the statements are authentic or not. Ignatius (110–117 A.D.) cites the story of Luke 24 : 36–49 in the version of the Gospel according to the Hebrews.[1] Papias (145–160 A.D.) in his youth (110–120?) preferred oral tradition to any written record for the "interpretation of the oracles of the Lord," though he fortunately gives the tradition regarding the origin of both Matthew and Mark, reporting their defects as well as their merits. Justin Martyr, writing ca. 155 A.D. for heathen readers, explains that the sources relied on by himself, and read for edification in the churches are "memorabilia of the Lord called Gospels," "written by Apostles and their followers," one of them "memorabilia of Peter." From his quotations, free as they are, it is easy to recognise our Matthew, Mark, and Luke. To-day it is even admitted to be possible to identify John, though Justin's acquaintance with this Gospel was long disputed. But Theophilus of Antioch (181–190 A.D.) is the first to cite a Gospel by name, quoting John 1 : 1 as from "John, one of those who were vessels of the Spirit."

Earliest references.

Not until the multiplication of secondary Gospel narratives in the age of Trajan[2] and the contemporary advance of a heretical pseudo-tradition by the Gnostics[3] could the necessity of citing a recognised authority for evangelic tradition be felt. In Apoc-

Special writings discriminated.

[1] So Jerome. Origen found the passage in the *Kerygma Petri*. Both are probably right. See Lightfoot, *Apost. Fathers, ad loc.*

[2] Eus. *Hist.*, 3 : 37.

[3] Cf. the *Pistis Sophia*, and the references to the *Gospel of Basilides*, *Traditions of Matthias*, etc. Cerinthus is said to have employed one of the forms of Matt. which excluded the virgin birth.

alypse it would seem to have been the extravagant claims of Montanism (157 A.D.) for its "prophetic" revelations which led to similar limitation.

Paul himself had directed a restricted reading and circulation of his letters (1 Thess. 5:27, Col. 4:16). These were, of course, frequently cherished and appealed to as evidence of Apostolic opinion where the oral authority of the officials appointed by the Apostles appeared indecisive. In the second century churches began the regular public reading of them for edification, not at first limiting themselves, however, to such as belonged to the Apostolic age.[1] But soon arose the theoretical requirement of "apostolicity"[2] which in the west led even to the exclusion of Hebrews. But before the time of such distinctions there were exceptional circumstances, as when the Church addressed had itself been the recipient of the letter, when epistles of Paul are referred to by name. There are three instances of this kind in writings of the Apostolic age: (i) Clement of Rome (93–96 A.D.) writes to the Corinthians: — Epistles.

"Take up the epistle[3] of the blessed Paul the Apostle . . . Of a truth he charged you in the Spirit concerning himself and Cephas and Apollos, because that even then ye had made parties." (1 Cor. 1:10 ff.)

---

[1] Thus about 170 A.D. Dionysius of Corinth writes to Soter, Bishop of Rome: "To-day we have passed the Lord's holy day, in which we have read your epistle. From it, whenever we read it, we shall always be able to draw advice, as also from the former epistle [of the Roman Church] written to us through Clement." The writing known as 2d Clement is perhaps the letter of Soter referred to.

[2] See Tertullian below (p. 33).

[3] 1 Cor. is very widely employed in the earliest period; no trace of 2 Cor. appears till much later; it appears to be unknown to this writer.

(ii) Ignatius (110–117 A.D.) writes to Ephesus: —

"Those who are borne by martyrdom to God pass through your city; ye are fellow-initiates in the mysteries (συμμύσται Eph. 3:3–5) with Paul, the sanctified, the martyred . . . who in every letter (Rom. 16:5, 1 Cor. 15:32, 16:8, 19, 2 Cor. 1:8 f. and 1 and 2 Tim.) makes mention of you."

(iii) Polycarp at the same date writes to the Philippians: —

"The blessed and glorious Paul wrote letters[1] to you, into which if ye look diligently ye can be built up."

Further on he writes: —

"Or are we ignorant that the saints shall judge the world as Paul teaches (1 Cor. 6:2)? . . . You, among whom the blessed Paul laboured, who were his letters (2 Cor. 3:2) in the beginning. For he glorieth of you (2 Cor. 8:1 ff.) in all those churches which alone at that time knew God; for we (of Smyrna) knew Him not as yet."

Gospels and Revelation.

A generation later we have Papias's tradition of the writings of Matthew and Mark, corroborated and supplemented by his contemporary, Justin Martyr, to the effect that "the memorabilia of the Lord called 'gospels' were written by Apostles and their companions;" we have also one further statement of Justin (*Dial.* 81): —

"John, one of the Apostles of Christ, prophesied, in a revelation made to him, that those who have believed on our Christ shall spend a thousand years in Jerusalem" (cf. Rev. 20:4).

140–170 A.D. The change in Christian authority.

With these exceptions we have no direct reference in early times to the authorship of the New Testament writings. The lifetime of Papias, who in his

[1] Even if our single epistle is composite, as many hold, it is not likely that Polycarp knew of more than one. Zahn suggests that the Macedonian church of Thessalonica and its letters may be included in thought.

youth preferred "the living and abiding voice," but about 145 A.D. himself joined in the endeavour to reduce it to writing, covers the momentous change in the Church from chief dependence on oral to chief dependence on written sources, when the question of authorship would begin to have significance. If, then, it is disappointing to find, in this period, within which the gradually increasing echoes soon enable us to determine the *existence* of nearly all the books, so little weight attached to their *authorship*, it is consoling to reflect that there was also no motive for forgery; since a Clement of Rome, to whom the sole written authority is "Scripture,"[1] may employ far more copiously the un-Apostolic letter to the Hebrews[2] than even that of Paul to the Corinthians, whom he is himself addressing. Just a century later Tertullian, a Father of the same Latin Church, excuses himself for citing from Hebrews on the ground that, although not Apostolic, it was written by Barnabas, "a companion of Apostles," who had been referred to by Paul (1 Cor. 9 : 6), and, in his treatise against Marcion, 4 : 2 (200–210 A.D.), lays down the following "principles": —

Apostolicity in 200 A.D.

"First, that the Evangelic Instrument[3] has Apostles for its authors, on whom this charge of publishing the gospel was

[1] Nearly one-fourth of the entire letter, equal in length to 1 and 2 Cor. combined, is occupied by citations from the O. T. appealed to as divine authority.

[2] Heb. is the model for whole paragraphs of Clem. Rom., but no reference whatever is made to it, though forty-seven "echoes" have been counted. There are clear traces of familiarity with Rom., Eph., 1 Pet., Jas., 1 Tim., and doubtful resemblances to others.

[3] Tertullian is the first to divide the Scriptures into an O. T. and N. T., and further divides the N. T. into "instrumenta," Evangelicum, Actorum, Pauli, Johanni (*Marc.* 4 : 2, 5 : 2, *De Resur.* 38, 40, *De Pudic.* 19).

imposed by the Lord himself: that if it includes the writings of Apostolic men also, still they were not alone, but wrote with the help of Apostles, and after the teaching of Apostles."

The growth of this now full-fledged theory of apostolicity should be a subject for careful study.

First collections of N. T. writings.

We have seen how Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp presuppose that, at least, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, and Philippians are read by those whom they address, and as letters of Paul. Ignatius (110–117 A.D.) refers to a whole group ("in every letter"). In 2 Peter (135–150 A.D. ?) this collection is to be studied along with "the other Scriptures" (2 Pet. 3:16). When it was formed and how constituted we do not know, but relative frequency of employment goes to show that Romans, 1 Corinthians, and Ephesians were more widely circulated than Galatians or Colossians. The year 140 A.D., however, is a date of vital significance in our history, for it marks the first attempt to frame a canon of New Testament Scripture.

Marcion's N. T. Canon.

Of Marcion, its author, we have already heard. The son of a Christian bishop in Phrygia, an ardent disciple of Paul, and a man of unblemished, though ascetic morality, he came to Rome ca. 138 A.D., convinced that a reform was necessary in the Church to free it from its continued slavery to Judaism. The most important means adopted was the rejection of the Old Testament, for which was substituted, in the numerous churches founded by him, his own "Gospel" and "Apostle." Of the then current practice of reading from the Gospels, together with the Prophets (Old Testament), we know from Justin Martyr. Marcion, however, not only removed the Old Testament, but excluded all gospels save that of Luke. His "Apostle" was simply our ten letters of Paul, excluding Hebrews and the Pastoral Epistles. Both "Gospel"

and "Apostle" were mutilated by arbitrary expurgation of what Marcion regarded as "Jewish interpolations." Whether his omission of 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, was for doctrinal or critical reasons, or both, is disputed.[1]

Ignatius.

The process which outside the Church was thus hastened by the repudiation of "Scripture" and ecclesiastical authority, was rapidly advancing within the pale. For Ignatius the divinely prescribed panacea is the Apostolic succession. Against the inroads of Docetic heretics in "the churches of Asia" he appeals not to Scripture, still less to the Johannine writings, though there are indications that he knows them,[2] but to the utterance he had himself made by special, divine revelation when among them: "I cried with a loud voice, with God's own voice, Give ye heed to the bishops and the presbytery and deacons." Ignatius, however, met opposition from a conservative element of the type of Clement of Rome, who disputed his interpretations of Scripture, saying: "If I find it not in the charters (the Old Testament) I believe it not in the Gospel. And when I said to them, It is written, they answered me, That is just the question."[3] His final answer was, "My charter is Jesus Christ," meaning the traditional teaching of Jesus.

Polycarp.

The contemporary exhortation of Polycarp to the Philippians to read diligently the letters of Paul,

[1] Jerome (*Expl. in Epist. ad Ti.*, IV, p. 407, ed. Benedict) declares that Basilides and Marcion rejected Heb. and the Pastoral Epp. as un-Pauline.

[2] So even Hilgenfeld and Holtzmann, who, however, date the Ignatian letters ca. 160. The traces of N. T. writings are very scanty, but include our Matt., 1 Cor., Eph., Rom., 2 Cor., Gal., Col., Phil., 1 Thess., Philem., 1 Pet., Jn. (?) Acts (?) in order of certainty.

[3] Philad. 8 : 2.

advice which he certainly had followed himself,[1] illustrates a third tendency, more in the spirit of Greek Christianity than the oriental hierocratic ideas of Ignatius, but equally divergent from the simple dependence of Clement of Rome on the Old Testament, without disparagement of it as in Marcion. New Testament writings are not appealed to by Polycarp as having the authority of "Scripture"; but the future is with him. There could be no contrast more significant of the predestined change, than that between Clement's epistle and his. The former barely refers twice to teachings of Jesus with the simple formula of Acts 20:35[2] and once to Paul; the latter is as saturated with New Testament phraseology as Clement with the Old Testament.

The standard of Barnabas.

One other tendency illustrative of the growing consciousness in the Church, of the need of some further written standard of its divine revelation than the Old Testament, is found in a writer perhaps contemporary with Marcion, viz. Pseudo-Barnabas (132 A.D.). "Barnabas" is an Alexandrian, representing the fourth of Harnack's tendencies. His standard is "Scripture," but the interpretation thereof was first revealed by Christ. "Barnabas" is indeed the first to refer to a brief "logion," preserved in Matthew 22:14, as "Scripture,"[3] but it is extremely doubtful if he was

[1] Polyc. unmistakably employs the language of Matt., Acts, Rom., 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Gal., Eph., Phil., 2 Thess., 1 Tim., 2 Tim., 1 Pet., 1 Jn.; and has in addition more or less trustworthy echoes of Mk., Lk., and 1 Thess.

[2] The one reference (13:2) is a free combination of Matt. 5:7, 6:14, 7:12 with Lk. 6:31, 36–38; the other (46:8) a free reproduction of Matt. 26:24, 18:6.

[3] Another trace or two of Matt. and a few echoes of Rom. and Heb. only heighten the contrast of his copious (allegorical) use of the O. T., including *Enoch* and other uncanonical writings, with his neglect of the N. T. Even the *Two Ways* chapters

conscious that the saying was of New Testament origin, for he sharply divides his epistle into two parts, (i) chs. 1–17, an interpretation of the Old Testament in the allegorical sense, without which it is to him quite as offensive as to Marcion; for in his view the Jews were only led to interpret it literally by the sophistry of "an evil angel," (ii) "the new Law of Christ, which is free from any yoke of constraint." This he presents in chs. 18–21 as "another lesson and teaching," giving it not in words of his own, nor in those of any New Testament writing, but, as now appears from the recent discovery of the *Teaching of the Lord through the Twelve Apostles*, in those of the *Two Ways*, a primitive "teaching of baptisms," or catechism for the instruction of neophytes in the rudiments of Christian morality, similarly incorporated in the "Teaching," 1–6.

That of the Διδαχή.

This document (131–160 A.D.),[1] as its title shows, regards the teaching of the Lord as supreme authority, but the significant difference from Clement's simple exhortation to "remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said," etc., is that here the direction is to "do *as ye find it* in the Gospel of our Lord," so that a written source has taken the place of general tradition, and this source is recognisable from the excerpts as our Matthew.[2] By "the ways of the Lord" as known

are devoid of the quotations from the Gospels with which the document has been enriched in the Διδ. text.

[1] It is dated by Holtzmann in 120–150. Harnack explains his unusually late dating as applying to the present form only. He regards the *Two Ways* as possibly even pre-Christian.

[2] Διδ. 15 : 4 ; cf. 8 : 2, 11 : 3. No certain trace of Mk. or Jn. appears. Matt. is employed seventeen times. In four cases the language approaches Lk., but these are in the later portions. Oral tradition is probably responsible for the logion Διδ. 1 : 6. There are traces of Rom., 1 Cor., Eph., 1 Thess., 2 Thess., 1 Pet., 1 Jn., Jd. (?).

through oral *and written* tradition, even those who speak in the Spirit are to be discerned as true or false prophets.[1]

Hermas.

In the *Shepherd* of Hermas (140 A.D., portions from twenty to twenty-five years earlier), tediously voluminous as it is, we look for no written revealed authority save the Old Testament, because the author, as Holtzmann says, regarded his own prophetic authority as equal to that of any Christian writer.[2] In fact, the only Scripture he anywhere quotes as such is Eldat and Modad, though he shows unmistakable dependence on James, 1 Corinthians, and Ephesians, and knows the Synoptic tradition, apparently in the form of Mark, but with traces of Matthew and Luke.[3]

Emergence of the Four Gospels.

By 150 A.D. a tendency was already manifesting itself to distinguish our four Gospels from the rapidly increasing mass of less authentic and often heretical material.[4] For the Syrian Church *the* (written) Gospel long continued to be that of Matthew, as it had been elsewhere. But there were many and widely differing writings which claimed to be "the Gospel according to Matthew," and the Church itself acknowledged that the work of the Apostle in its original form was no longer in its possession. It is possible that we

[1] 11 : 1 ff.

[2] *Einleitung*[3], p. 92. For Hermas's idea of prophetic inspiration, including his own, see the passage above referred to in *Mand.* 11, p. 29.

[3] Hermas's acquaintance with other N. T. writings may be shown in order of probability as follows : Heb., 1 Pet., Jn., Acts, Rev. In all cases the use is extremely scanty.

[4] The resemblance of *Vis.* 3 : 13 to Iren. *Her.* 3 : 11, 8 has been used to trace it back even to Hermas. Irenæus doubtless does depend on Hermas for his (probably correct) interpretation of the four cherubim supporting the throne of Christ as the four Elements (στοιχεία) ; but the further comparison of these to the four Gospels is an idea of his own.

have still a trace of these early disputes in the Syriac manuscript entitled "As to the Star: showing how and by what means the Magi knew the Star, and that Joseph did not take Mary as his wife."[1] In its present form this is only a worthless legend in support of the perpetual virginity of Mary, but, as Hilgenfeld observes, it preserves certain dates of remarkable significance. The visit of the Magi to Bethlehem (Matt. 2:1–13) is declared to have been "in the three hundred and eleventh year (Seleucid era = 1 B.C.) in the second year of our Redeemer" (cf. Matt. 2:16). The incident itself is declared to have been authenticated by a council assembled for the purpose in Rome "in the year 430 (= 119 A.D.), under the reign of Hadrianus Cæsar, in the consulship of Severus and Fulgus, and the episcopate of Xystus (Sixtus I), bishop of the city of Rome."[2]

Their relative currency.

The proportionate use in early writers would indicate that Mark and Luke came next in order of authority, but at a considerable interval after Matthew; then, after Luke, John; and again at a considerable interval, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, Gospel of Peter, etc.

Justin and Papias.

But we are fortunately supplied with a comparatively full and certainly trustworthy statement of the process from one who himself had lived through the change from Clement, with his mere memoriter combinations of any or all sources for the tradition of

[1] Published by W. Wright in *Journ. of Sacred Lit.*, October, 1866. See Hilgenfeld's article "Das Kanon. Mtev." in *Zts. f. w. Th.*, 1895, p. 449.

[2] Other forms than Matt.'s of the story of the Virgin and Star were in circulation at this time (cf. Rev. 12:1 f., 5 with Ign. *ad Eph.* 19:1–3, and the legend attributed to Africanus). An early ecclesiastical decision in Rome may have supported the canonical version against the Ebionites and Adoptionists who rejected Matt. 1:18, 2:23.

the Lord's teaching, to Justin Martyr, substantially limiting himself to "the memoirs written by apostles and the companions of apostles," publicly read in the churches. The fragment of Papias's *Expositions of the Oracles of the Lord*, recently published by De Boor, states that some of those brought to life by Jesus "lived until the time of Hadrian,"[1] implying a date for the work as late as Justin (145–160 A.D.).

Papias was probably acquainted with our third Gospel; for his earlier contemporary, Marcion, a native of Papias's own neighbourhood (Hierapolis in Phrygia), had given it a position which would seem to imply both its previous wide acceptance and traditions connecting its author with Paul. Moreover, Holtzmann and others have pointed out how Papias's preface seems written in "obvious imitation of Luke 1:1–4." He cannot have been ignorant of our canonical Matthew, and it is in the highest degree probable that he knew our fourth Gospel as well. This appears from Irenæus's citations of the *Reliques of the Elders*, which Lightfoot and Harnack agree must have been taken from the work of Papias, and which embody Johannine material, and from certain resemblances of his style to 1 John and 3 John, and still more from the explicit and wholly trustworthy statement of Eusebius (*Hist.* 3:39, 16), "The same writer (Papias) uses testimonies from the first Epistle of John and from that of Peter likewise." And yet he cannot have referred to the

[1] If the fragment is really from Papias, it shows dependence on his part on the Apology of Quadratus, addressed to Hadrian, which had declared as to the persons *healed and* raised by Jesus that "they were alive after his death for quite a while, so that some of them lived even to our day." If Quadratus was then an old man his statement might well be true. In the Chronicle Eusebius dates his Apology 124–125 A.D., and calls him an auditor Apostolorum.

origin of either Luke or John,[1] for Eusebius, who gives us his testimony as to Matthew and Mark, and after searching through his book notes that "he uses testimonies from 1 John," was particularly in search of two things which he promises to give to his readers: (i) evidence of the early *use* of the then *disputed* books, among which neither 1 Peter nor 1 John are included; (ii) data as to the *origin* of the *undisputed* books, particularly the Gospels.[2] But Eusebius has not a word as to Luke or John from this source. We cannot reasonably account for this silence in the "preface" of Papias's work, wherein he gave his authorities both oral and written, if he placed the Gospels of Luke and John in the same category with the two which he describes and defends as Apostolic and trustworthy. Most probably he regarded it as important to give what tradition reported of the two *ancient* Gospels by Palestinian authorities, because these had formed the substratum for later writers, whom he might regard as belonging rather to his own generation, among authors of evangelic compendia he had already alluded to in general terms.[3] His statement as to his method and authorities was as follows: —

Papias's tradition.

"But I will not scruple also to give a place for you along with my interpretations to everything that I learnt carefully,

---

[1] In spite of the Argumentum to the Gospel of John in a late Vatican manuscript: "The Gospel of John was published and given to the churches by John while yet alive (Jn. 21 : 23 f.), as Papias of Hierapolis, a beloved disciple of John (!), relates in his five exoteric (*sic*) books."

[2] *Hist.* 3 : 3, 3, and 5 : 8, 1.

[3] We must beware of prejudging the question of the authorship of the fourth Gospel; yet it must be admitted that the growing evidence of Papias's acquaintance with it involves the serious difficulty of his apparent inability to refer to the direct testimony of the Apostle in either oral or written form, though *Apostolic* testimony was the object of his search.

and remembered carefully in time past[1] from the elders, guaranteeing its truth. For unlike the many, I did not take pleasure in those who have so very much to say, but in those who teach the truth; nor in those who relate alien commandments (Gnostic evangelists), but in those who record such as were given from the Lord to the Faith, and who are sprung from the truth itself (cf. 3 Jn. 12). If, then, any one came who had been a follower of the Elders, I would question him about the words of the Elders[2] — what (by their report) Andrew or what Peter had said, or what had been said by Philip, or by Thomas, or by James, or by John, or by Matthew, or by any other of the disciples of the Lord, and what things Aristion and the Elder John the disciples of these were saying.[3] For I did not think I could get so much profit from the contents of books, as from the utterances of a living and abiding voice."

---

[1] The expressions indicate a rather remote past (100–120 A.D. ?), yet not remote enough for Papias to know directly any Apostle; this, Eusebius tells us, he testified himself.

[2] *I.e.* what the Palestinian Elders — by no means to be confounded with the Apostles, but authorities who could remember Apostles, — reported the words of the Apostles to have been. Of these "elders," two, Aristion and John, were actual disciples of the Apostles, which made their own sayings independently worthy of reporting.

[3] For ΤΟΥ$\overline{\text{ΚΥ}}$ read ΤΟΥ$\overline{\text{Τω}}$. See my article in *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.* 1897. The Apostles were dead; Aristion and the Elder John were still living; hence the contrast in tense (εἶπεν, λέγουσιν). But Papias had no direct access even to the latter, save through their writings. Aristion he quoted so freely that Eusebius takes him to have been directly his hearer. Mk. 16: 9–20 is now known to have been taken from the Gospel compend of a "Presbyter Ariston," probably the same work. The Presbyter John is not known as a writer; for though 2 Jn., 3 Jn., are addressed by "the Presbyter," the name "John" appears only in the titles added by scribes on the assumption of Apostolic authorship for both Epistles and Gospel. If the question is asked, Why does not Papias refer to his contemporary and near neighbour Polycarp, a disciple of the Apostle John, for traditions of this kind, rather than to less famous men only indirectly accessible to him, our answer must be, the inquiries were as to Palestinian tradition, and the title

His primitive gospels.

Of a different character to Papias's mind, however, from the "books" which he treated as inferior to oral tradition, must have been at least the two sources as to whose origin he took pains to obtain the testimony of "the Presbyter"; for it cannot be supposed that he placed more reliance on reports of "what had been said by Matthew," than on what he believed to be the writing of Matthew himself. The tradition is given as follows: —

"This also the Presbyter (probably John) said: Mark, who had been (γενόμενος, spoken of an ex-official) the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately, though not, indeed, in order, everything that he remembered, whether of things said or things done by Christ.[1] For he was neither a hearer nor a follower of the Lord, but afterwards, as I said, of Peter, who adapted his instructions to requirements, and had no design of giving a connected account of the Lord's oracles (or 'sayings' λόγων; other manuscripts have λογίων). So then Mark made no error while he thus wrote down some things as he remembered them;[2] for he made it his one care not to omit anything that he heard, or to set down any false statement therein."

"Presbyter" as well as the remoteness of Aristion and John from Papias goes to show that they were living in Palestine, the home of Gospel story. Possibly these are none other than Aristo of Pella, author of a *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus* (ca. 135 A.D.), and John, mentioned seventh among the fifteen bishops — more properly Elders — of the Palestinian Church before 135 A.D., by Eusebius (*Hist.* 4 : 5, 3).

[1] What follows may be only Papias's explanation of the tradition. The ἢ λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα appears to distinguish Mk.'s work from Matt.'s which had been a compilation of sayings only (λόγια). Acts 1 : 1 similarly refers to the former treatise as a record "both of teachings and doings of Jesus."

[2] The Muratorian fragment (see below) begins: [*ali*] *quibus tamen interfuit et ita posuit*, spoken of Mk., apparently in dependence on this same tradition, but going quite beyond it. The meaning is quite as likely to be: In certain enlargements made upon other forms of the story (Matt.) Mk. is not to be deemed arbitrary, for he is only recording — and that with reverential care — what he had heard from Peter.

Perhaps a little higher up the page, probably on authority of the same Presbyter, Papias had written: —

"So, then, Matthew composed the oracles in the Hebrew (or Aramaic) language, and each one interpreted them as he could."

The *Logia* already obsolete.

It is here implied that the original work of Matthew was no longer extant or accessible. In Papias's day it had already been superseded by our own Greek Matthew, for the need of translation, every man for himself, no longer existed. But had the translator confined himself to simple translation, or had he amplified and interpreted after the manner common at the time?[1] Had he reset the simple "sayings"[2] in a narrative of the "doings" after the manner of Mark, and prefixed to it the story of Jesus' birth and childhood? Only internal evidence can decide how close was the relation of the "Hebrew" writing to the Greek. The mere fact that Papias regarded the *Logia* as the original of our Matthew can decide nothing; for Jerome, who had translated the Gospel according to the Hebrews into both Latin and Greek, and who gives us a number of passages showing the wide divergence of its tradition, also regarded it as "the original Hebrew Matthew." Epiphanius regarded the Hebrew Gospel used by the Nazarenes, which was not simply our Matthew in another language, but a separate Gospel, differing both from it and from that employed by the Ebionites, as "the original Hebrew Matthew." We are rather led to infer from Papias's description of the *Logia* as tradition reported the work (συνεγράψατο — some manuscripts συνετάξατο — τὰ λόγια), and from the fact that he adopts from oral tradition an account of the death of Judas as wholly at variance

[1] As in the *Test. of the XII Patriarchs.*
[2] Referred to hereinafter as the *Logia.*

with Matt. 27:3–10 as with Acts 1:18, that there were elements of his own (our) Matthew which he did not regard as having the direct sanction of the Apostle. This need not imply that he held views like Jerome's or Epiphanius's, though Eusebius found "the story of a woman accused of many sins before the Lord" (cf. Jn. 7:53–8:11), which Papias related, in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. Luke and John will have been to him among the "books"[1] which like Aristion's he used, but gave no account of, esteeming them secondary to the "living and abiding voice." Of 1 John and 1 Peter, as already stated, we only know that he used them. With regard to Revelation, the case is different. Andreas of Cæsarea (ca. 490) not only quotes Papias "word for word" in passages dependent on Revelation, but declares that he "bore testimony to its genuineness." A multitude of writers, including Eusebius, testify to how great an extent both Papias and his successors of the Ephesian school were affected by this book.

His use of other N. T. books.

Thus between Papias's youth and his old age dependence on tradition has given way to books, for Papias himself is then content to write down what he had heard from the daughters of Philip the evangelist. Justin, his younger contemporary, as we have seen, employs our four Gospels as directly or indirectly Apostolic. Occasionally he takes up an uncanonical tradition, but in all his seventeen or eighteen express references to the "Memoirs" he uses our Synoptics, while his fifty allusions in the two *Apologies* (152–153 A.D.) and seventy in the *Dialogue* (155–160 A.D.) point to the same authorities. The last serious denials have been silenced by modern discovery. The Akhmim

Growing dependence on "books."

[1] See the passage from Iren. quoted below (p. 50), "Luke recorded in a book," etc.

fragment of the *Gospel of Peter*[1] (100–130 A.D.) dispelled all theories which made this the source of Justin's quotations and identified it with his Memoirs of Peter (*i.e.* Mark). It made the preëminence of the four yet more apparent by the evidences of dependence on these by the *Gospel of Peter* itself. Serapion of Antioch (191–211 A.D.) found indeed this Gospel still employed for public reading in a church of his diocese (Rhossus), and for a time tolerated, but afterward suppressed it as heretical.

Ciasca's publication of the *Diatessaron*,[2] or *Harmony of the Four Gospels*, by Tatian, a pupil of Justin (160–170, 172? A.D.) forever settled all questions as to which four had been thus employed, and showed their relative standing. Finally Mrs. Lewis's discovery of the Sinaitic Syriac, a version of our four Gospels of 160–170 A.D., fairly leads us over to the history of the text.

Their authority.

But we should beware of the hasty inference that even the four Gospels had yet become a "scriptural" authority. Justin has still substantially the same standard as Clement of Rome, "Scripture" and the "Teaching of the Lord." "We have been commanded by Christ himself," he writes, "to obey not the teaching of men (Matt. 23 : 8–10), but those precepts which were proclaimed by the blessed Prophets, and taught by himself."[3] Only now the more trustworthy record of the teaching is beginning to be differentiated as "Apostolic" from the unauthentic. Besides Scripture and the Lord's teaching, Justin recognises but a single writing which possesses a claim to special authority. The *Revelation of John, one of the Apostles*

[1] See the ed. of H. B. Swete, London, 1893, and Krüger, *Hist. of Chr. Lit.*, p. 53.

[2] Engl. by J. H. Hill, Edinb., 1894.

[3] *Dial.*, c. 48.

of Christ has the twofold claim of its "prophetic" character, and its apostolicity.[1]

Irenæus's treatment of the N. T. books and tradition of their origin.

With Justin and Tatian we are thus only at the beginning of the road which with Irenæus (174–189 A.D.) leads to the exclusive use of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John[2] and treatment even of the evangelist's own language as inspired.[3] But the only writing besides these of which even Irenæus is concerned to give the tradition is Revelation, which he not only declares authentic on the authority of "those who saw John face to face," but tells us that "the revelation was seen not long ago, but almost in our own generation, toward the end of the reign of Domitian." Incidentally he quotes 1 Jn. 2:18 as from "the Epistle"[4] of John the author of the Gospel, and is the first to connect 1 Peter with the Apostle, quoting it with the formula "Peter says,"[5] but he reserves the title "Scripture" for Hermas,[6] which as "prophetic" is entitled to rank with the Evangelic Word and the Revelation of John. His tradition as to the Gospels we must cite in full: —

"Matthew then published his Gospel among the Hebrews in their own language, while Peter and Paul were preaching and

---

[1] There are a few traces of acquaintance with all the Pauline Epistles except Phil., Philem., and the Pastoral Epistles, but Justin does not so much as mention the name of Paul, much less can we suppose he would treat letters, even those of Apostles, as "Scripture."

[2] In *Her.* 3 : 11, 8 he resorts to extraordinary analogies to show that there must in the nature of the case be four Gospels and only four.

[3] *Her.* 3 : 16, 2 has Spiritus Sanctus per Matthæum ait, quoting Matt. 1 : 18.

[4] In 3 : 16, 8 and 1 : 16, 3 he also quotes 2 Jn. without distinguishing it from 1 Jn.

[5] In 4 : 16, 5 and 5 : 7, 2.

[6] 4 : 20, 2 ; cf. Eus. *Hist.* 5 : 8, 7.

founding the Church in Rome (60–67 A.D.).[1] After their decease Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, also transmitted to us in writing those things which Peter had preached; and Luke the attendant of Paul, recorded in a book the Gospel which Paul had declared. Afterward John, the disciple of the Lord, who also reclined on his bosom, published his Gospel while staying at Ephesus in Asia."[2]

Clement of Alexandria.

Eusebius, mindful of his "promise," reports to us finally the account of all the New Testament writings as preserved in a work, now lost, of Tertullian's great contemporary, Clement of Alexandria. "Clement gave," he says, "in the Hypotyposes, abridged accounts of all canonical Scripture, not omitting the disputed books — I refer to Jude and the other Catholic epistles, and Barnabas and the so-called Apocalypse of Peter." But all he finds worthy of citation here is a rather forlorn attempt of Clement's to explain Hebrews as written by Paul in Hebrew and translated by Luke. Paul refrained from signing his name out of consideration for the Hebrews. We understand the motive of this plea when we remember Tertullian's apology for citing this epistle to the Hebrews "from Barnabas" in spite of its non-apostolic origin. Elsewhere in the Hypotyposes Clement gave "the tradition of the earliest presbyters"[3] as to the order of the Gospels: —

"The Gospels containing the genealogies, he says, were written first. The Gospel according to Mark had this occasion.

---

[1] Irenæus makes the same effort as Tertullian to trace the Gospels to the Apostles themselves, but is unable to say that Matthew translated his own Gospel into Greek.

[2] *Her.* 3: 1, 1. In 3: 11, 1 he tells us that John's Gospel was written "to correct the errors of Cerinthus."

[3] In the *Stromata* 1: 1 these "elders" are described as living in Ionia, Italy, Cœle-Syria, Egypt, Palestine, and the East.

As Peter had preached the word publicly at Rome, and declared the Gospel by the Spirit, many who were present requested that Mark, who had followed him for a long time and remembered his sayings, should write them out. And having composed the Gospel he gave it to those who had requested it. When Peter learned of this he neither directly forbade nor encouraged it.[1] But last of all John, perceiving that the external facts had been made plain in the Gospel, being urged by his friends, and inspired by the Spirit, composed a spiritual Gospel."[2]

Tradition in 200 A.D. as to the epistles.

We see that the tradition as to the Gospels was already stereotyped. As to the thirteen Pauline letters, only a few heretics like Marcion rejected the Pastoral Epistles, while the growing tendency to make apostolicity the test of inspiration, coöperated with the general practice of public reading in the churches rapidly to raise them to the level of inspired Scripture, along with Gospels and Apocalypses. A third "instrumentum," to adopt Tertullian's word, was necessary to accommodate the second part of Luke's "book," and still a fourth for 1 Peter and 1 John; for the latter, while making no direct claim like 1 Peter to apostolicity, was as inseparable logically from the fourth Gospel as Acts from Luke.

For writings like Hebrews, James, Jude, 2 John, 3 John (superscribed "the Elder") which made no direct claim to apostolicity, and 2 Peter, whose claims though explicit, were very ill supported, the changed requirements created difficulties. Hebrews had such weighty support in ancient use that pretexts were found in the East, as in the case of the writings of

[1] If Peter's attitude is taken toward the act of Mark, as the order suggests, and not toward the *proposal* only, it is both inexplicable in itself and flatly contradicts Irenæus. The qualifications of Mark here specified suggest that in its original form the tradition agreed with Irenæus and the γενόμενος of Papias, inverting the order of the last two sentences.

[2] Eus. *Hist.* 6 : 14, 1, 5, 6.

Luke, for smuggling it in at the end of the *Instrumentum Pauli.* In the West it was reluctantly excluded. James was known anciently, but only locally; when accepted, its author was identified with the Apostle, the son of Alphæus. The like may be said of Jude. Affinity with 1 John was the plea of 2 John and 3 John; for real tradition was silent.

The Canon of Muratori. 1. The Gospels.

Tradition, legend, and inference from the text are intermingled in the ancient fragment discovered by Muratori, giving the list of writings in ecclesiastic use at Rome toward the close of the second century. It will show us, more graphically than description, what the Church had then come to regard as the origin and content of its New Testament Canon. It begins in the midst of a sentence relating to Mark.

. . . . in some[1] (?) things, however, he participated, and has thus recorded them.

The third book of the Gospel according to Luke. Luke compiled in his own name from report, the physician whom Paul took with him after the ascension of Christ, as it were for a travelling companion: however he did not himself see the Lord in the flesh, and hence begins his account with the birth of John as he was able to trace (matters) up.[2]

Of the fourth of the Gospels (the author is) John, one of the disciples.[3] At the instance of his fellow disciples and bishops he said, "Fast with me three days and whatever shall be revealed to each, let us relate it to one another." The same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the Apostles, that John should write all in his own name, the rest revising.[4] . . . And

---

[1] [*ali*] *quibus interfuit.*

[2] This and the contemporary notice of Iren. 3 : 1, 1 are the first direct ascriptions of Lk. and Acts to Luke (cf. Col. 4 : 14, Philem. 24, 2 Tim. 4 : 11). Eusebius adds (*Hist.* 3 : 4, 6), doubtless from ancient tradition, that he "was of Antiochian parentage."

[3] Original: Quarti evangeliorum Johannes ex decipolis (*sic*).

[4] A further elaboration of the tradition of Clement of Alexandria above cited, probably based on Jn. 21 : 24, and here

therefore, although varying ideas may be taught in the several books of the Evangelists, there is no difference in that which pertains to the faith of believers, since by one sovereign Spirit in all are declared all things that relate to the nativity (of Jesus), his passion, resurrection, intercourse with his disciples, and concerning his twofold advent, the first in humble guise, which has taken place, the second splendid with royal power, which is yet to be. . . . What wonder, then, if John in his epistle also, speaking of his own authorship, so boldly advances each detail, saying, "What we have seen with our eyes, and have heard with our ears, and our hands have handled, these things we have written."[1] For thus he professes himself not only an eye-witness, but a hearer, yea, and a writer as well, of all the wonders done by the Lord in their order.

2. The Epistle of John and Acts of Luke.

But the Acts of all the Apostles are written in a single book. Luke relates them admirably[2] to Theophilus, confining himself to such as fell under his own notice, as he plainly shows by the omission of all reference either to the martyrdom of Peter or the journey of Paul from Rome to Spain.[3] . . .

3. The Epistles of Paul.

But the letters of Paul themselves make known to those who would know both what they are, and from what place, on what occasion they were sent. At considerable length he wrote to the Corinthians first, forbidding schismatic divisions, then to the Galatians (forbidding) circumcision, and to the Romans (expounding) the general tenor of the Scriptures, showing, however, that Christ is the essence of their teaching; to these (epistles) we must devote separate discussion;[4] for the blessed

---

perhaps taken from the Acts of John (160 A.D.). Clement and Irenæus preserve other and more trustworthy traditions as to the old age of John in Ephesus. Polycrates, writing to Victor of Rome in 185 A.D., at the age of sixty-five, appeals to "John, who was both a martyr (Rev. 1 : 9) and a teacher, who reclined upon the bosom of the Lord (Jn. 13 : 23), and being a priest wore the πέταλον, who fell asleep at Ephesus." Polycarp, Melito, and others were held to have been John's personal disciples.

[1] 1 Jn. 1 : 1.

[2] Optime Theophilo; a misrendering of κράτιστε Θεόφιλε?

[3] Corrupt text. The rendering is approximate.

[4] An indication that the work from which the Fragment is an extract went on to expound the N. T. Lightfoot conjectures that it was taken from a work of Hippolytus.

Apostle Paul himself, following the example of his predecessor[1] John, wrote by name to seven churches only in this order: First to the Corinthians, second to the Ephesians, third to the Philippians, fourth to the Colossians, fifth to the Galatians, sixth to the Thessalonians, seventh to the Romans. True, he wrote twice to the Corinthians and Thessalonians for their correction, but he shows thereby[2] the unity of the universal church; for John also in the Apocalypse, though he writes to seven churches only, yet speaks to all.[3] He also writes one to Philemon, one to Titus, and two to Timothy, out of personal regard and affection, but these too are hallowed in the respect of the Catholic Church for the arrangement of ecclesiastical discipline. Moreover there is in circulation an Epistle to the Laodiceans,[4] another to the Alexandrians forged under the name of Paul, looking toward the heresy of Marcion,[5] and several others which cannot be received into the Catholic Church; for gall should not be mixed with honey. However, the Epistle of Jude, and two of John the above named are received among Catholics. Also the Book of Wisdom written by the friends of Solomon in his honour.[6]

Apocalypses.

We receive, moreover, the Apocalypse of John and Peter[7]

---

[1] Gal. 1 : 17. An allusion to Rev. 1–3.

[2] In the number seven. [3] Rev. 2 : 7, 11, 17, etc.

[4] Probably only Marcion's mutilated form of Eph., which had this title.

[5] Unknown.

[6] The author's *Instrumentum Evangelicum* included a reference to 1 Jn., and doubtless (in connection with Mk.) to 1 Pet. His *Instrumentum Actorum* followed. His *Apostolicon* consisted of an *Instrumentum Pauli* in two parts, the limits of the second being defended against dispute. This was followed by a group of writings of secondary (non-apostolic) authority, like the O. T. apocryphon Wisdom (cf. Eus. *Hist.* 5 : 8, 6 : 13). This included Jd., 2 Jn., 3 Jn. 2 Pet. seems to be unknown, Jas. either unknown or ignored. Heb. cannot have been unknown and there are no signs of accidental mutilation. It was omitted beyond doubt because known to be unapostolic. "Prophecy" is the last group of the Canon, and only the "Apostolic" prophecies are admitted.

[7] 120–140 A.D. See the ed. of Robinson and James from the Akhmim fragment, London, 1892, and Krüger, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

only, though some of our body will not have the latter read in the Church. The *Shepherd* indeed was written quite recently in our own times in the city of Rome by Hermas, while his brother Pius occupied the seat of Bishop of the Church of Rome (130–155 A.D.) [1]; wherefore the private reading of it is indeed commendable, but it can never be publicly read to the people in the Church whether among the Prophets . . . or among the Apostles.

We receive nothing whatever of the Arsinoite, or Valentinus, or of Mitias (?) . . . Who also were the compilers of the new Book of Psalms (?) for Marcion, together with Basilides . . . [2]

We thus reach the New Testament of Tertullian and Origen, a Canon of sacred writings not yet fully determined as to its outer limit, but with an already stereotyped tradition as to the origin and nature of those received by us except James and 2 Peter. The tradition is partly historical, partly inferential and theoretical, with a liberal element of legend. It is for the modern critic to analyse and interpret it.[3]

[1] An indication of the author's own date. Like Tertullian he objects to Hermas and makes it as "recent" as possible.

[2] The concluding paragraph, relating to various Gnostic writings is corrupt and mutilated.

[3] Besides the works above cited see Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century*, 1876 and Reuss, *Histoire du Canon des Saintes Écritures dans l'Église Chrétienne*, [2]1863, Engl. 1884, and in particular Euseb. *Hist.* 3 : 3, 23–25, 36–39, 5 : 8, 6 : 14, 25. Popular and interesting is E. H. Hall's *Papias and his Contemporaries*, 1899, and D. S. Muzzey's *Rise of the New Testament*, 1900.

PART II

THE PAULINE EPISTLES

CHAPTER III

THE EPISTLES OF THE FIRST PERIOD: THE LETTER TO THE GALATIANS AND CORRESPONDENCE WITH THESSALONICA

Tradition on the priority of the Pauline Epistles.

ANCIENT tradition is unanimous in placing first chronologically the Epistles of Paul, both as individual writings and as a collection, though the superior authority of the Teachings of the Lord soon led to the placing of the Gospels first in the Canon. The mere fact that the epistles were earliest read in the churches, and thus soonest gathered into a collection, of course could not suffice to give them precedence over Marcion's single Gospel, much less at a later time over "the sacred quaternion." Sporadic modern attempts to find writings earlier than Paul's among the Catholic Epistles,[1] or elsewhere in the New Testament, have no support in ancient tradition, and are inherently improbable as well as contrary to the indications of the text. The Muratorian fragmentist possessed no tradition of the origin and occasion of the letters of Paul,

[1] As B. Weiss, explaining the relation of 1 Pet. to Rom. and Eph. by dependence on the part of Paul (!), and others who apply similar reasoning to Jas.

but had already observed that they are self-explanatory on this score; the letters in turn explain the rise of a literature of this type in the Church, and the process cannot be inverted. The Canon of Marcion is proof positive of the collection having contained at least the ten letters accepted by him in 138 A.D. and earlier. But it is supposable that some portion even of this was of unauthentic material, so that in the case of 2 Thessalonians and Ephesians, the two against which a scientific modern criticism still raises doubts, we must weigh both internal and external evidence. In the case of all we must look to "the letters themselves" to "know both what they are and from what place, on what occasion they were sent."

Periods in Paul's literary career.

The literary activity of Paul is separated into two well-marked periods. The great crisis to which he is looking forward in Rom. 15:25–33, resulted, as we know from the pen of a companion, in nearly three years of relatively close imprisonment, after which, though still a captive, his circumstances are changed, as well as the dangers that beset his churches, and therewith the character of the teaching by which he would defend them. The theory of Meyer and others, which assigns Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, if not Philippians as well, to the captivity of Cæsarea rather than Rome, rests largely on the false reading ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in Eph. 1:1, and cannot adequately explain the Apostle's accessibility nor his confident expectation of release and promise of a visit, Philem. 22. These four, known as Epistles of the Captivity from the repeated allusions of the author to his bonds, were sent from Rome, three of them on a single occasion. The four which, from the time of the Muratorian fragmentist down, have stood apart as the great doctrinal epistles, Galatians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Romans, belong to an earlier period, but are only disso-

ciated from the perhaps still earlier 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, by the accidental circumstance that in Thessalonica the difficulties grappled with were of a different and less serious character. These six might be classed together as the Missionary Epistles.

Admitted authenticity of the major epistles.

With the unimportant exception of 2 Thessalonians, no doubt exists to-day among scientific critics regarding the authenticity of any one of them, for indeed 1 Corinthians is referred to in 96 A.D. as written by Paul to Corinth, and this and others of the group can be traced even further back as employed by Hebrews, 1 Peter, and James. Moreover, the impression of vivid feeling, of intense and close relation to objective fact, produced by the writings themselves is corroborated by the largely contemporary tradition of Acts, which shows just such combination of agreement in essentials and discrepancy in detail as we expect from honest witnesses.[1]

For the circumstances of the Apostle during the critical years of his career between the cutting loose from his missionary base at Antioch and the carrying to Jerusalem of the first fruits of the Gentile churches founded by his independent efforts, we must refer to the lives of Paul,[2] preëminently to the autobiography

[1] See Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ*, still the best general statement of the agreement. As to the internal evidence it was Baur who said of these four: "They bear on themselves so incontestably the character of Pauline originality that it is not possible for critical doubt to be exercised upon them with any show of reason."

[2] Besides that of Professor Rush Rhees in the present series, see those of Baur (Engl. tr.), Conybeare and Howson, Farrar, Lewin, Renan, (Engl. tr.), Sabatier, (Engl. tr. 1891), and O. Cone, 1898, with articles on Paul in B. D.'s and Enc.'s.

New archæological and geographical data of value have been contributed by Professor W. M. Ramsay, in the works below cited (p. 59, n. 1).

prefixed to his first great letter as a defence of his independent position.

Galatians the earliest N. T. writing.

There is reason to regard Galatians as written in 50 A.D., earliest of all the epistles of Paul which have survived to us; or, if not, as antedated only a few weeks or months by 1 and 2 Thessalonians. Nothing in the epistle itself gives much indication of the place of writing. Zahn infers, however, from 4 : 20, that the place was Corinth, because the readers require no explanation of Paul's inability to visit them, which could hardly have been the case at Antioch or Ephesus, the alternative localities.[1] This early date is supported by the fact that Paul has but just heard the disheartening news which calls forth his mingled denunciation and pleading (1 : 6–10, 3 : 1–3, 4 : 19, 20). The time seemed to him marvellously short (1 : 6) for the change which had come over the Galatian churches since a second visit (4 : 13) he had made them, on which he and a companion apparently included in Paul's present circle, though not participant in the letter, had warned them against the danger (1 : 9).[2] It was not so long after the agreement among the Apostles at Jerusalem regarding the freedom of Gentile converts from circumcision and the Law, and the subsequent disagreement of Paul with Peter and Barnabas at Antioch, regarding the basis of table fellowship between circumcised and uncircumcised Christians, but that a

[1] Ramsay, *Paul*, p. 191, suggests Antioch, on occasion of Acts 18 : 23; McGiffert, *Ap. Age*, p. 226 f., Antioch on occasion of Gal. 2 : 11, which is excluded by 4 : 13 τὸ πρότερον. Older authorities say Ephesus, Acts 19 : 8–10.

[2] Not "I reiterate," but "as *we* said before, so *I* now repeat." Barnabas, therefore, cannot well be meant (cf. 2 : 13). Silas might be (Acts 15 : 40–16 : 6), especially as on Paul's first arrival in Corinth he was still in Macedonia (Acts 18 : 5). The previous warning by "us" must, therefore, be assigned to the visit of Acts 15 : 40–16 : 6.

clear and explicit statement of the facts, however painful, should seem requisite to Paul. It was long enough after these events, related in their true order in Galatians c. 2, and somewhat more confusedly in Acts c. 15, for Paul's Judaizing opponents to have distorted and misrepresented them in their endeavour to make proselytes of his converts. Indeed, Paul doubted if his statement were not already too late (4:11).

Its date and occasion.

All of these data are best accounted for on the supposition that Paul had just completed the great journey of evangelization, which, beginning with a second visit to the churches of Southern Galatia and Phrygia (Acts 15:40–16:6), had led him across the Hellespont, through Macedonia and Achaia, and now had brought him to Corinth (Acts 18:1), whence communication with the Galatian churches by way of Ephesus would be relatively easy.[1] We take this to have been early in the spring of 50 A.D.[2]

The churches of Galatia those of Acts 13 and 14.

It is involved in the foregoing that "the churches of Galatia" (1:2) are the same whose foundation by Paul and Barnabas forms so conspicuous an element in the story of Acts, leading over directly in cc. 13, 14 to the great crisis in Jerusalem, c. 15; for the once dominant "North-Galatian" theory, which interpolated the evangelization of Central Asia Minor in Acts 16:6 has no room for a second visit of Paul to Galatia

[1] Zahn thinks that in 1 Thess. 1:8 we have actual evidence that news of Paul's work in Thessalonica had gone to Timothy's home in Lystra, and an answer been brought to Paul in Corinth.

[2] Our chronology of Paul's career has been fully developed in a series of three articles followed in 1897 in the *Expositor*, of which the first appeared in February, 1896, the other two in November and December, 1899. Somewhat similar results were obtained independently by C. H. Turner, art. "Chronology" in Hastings' *Bible Dic.*, 1898.

until Acts 18:23. It is true that in Acts, Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch in Pisidia (Acts 13:14, 14:6) are not spoken of as Galatian, or, at most, are included in "the region which is Phrygian and Galatic" (*τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*, 16:6, *vera lect.*), and there are important authorities who consider it impossible that Paul should have addressed these converts, even if subsequent effort had extended the original field northward and eastward (Acts 16:6), as "men of Galatia" (Gal. 3:1).[1] But Paul's practice differs from Luke's in that he habitually employs Roman geographical terms rather than popular designations such as Phrygia, Lycaonia, Pisidia, and by Roman terminology these cities had been "Galatian" for seventy-five years. Other objections are insignificant as against the improbability that the historian of the transition of the Gospel from the Jewish to the Gentile world should have related at great length the evangelisation of four cities which had no particular connection with the great struggle, while overlooking entirely, or mentioning only in passing (Acts 16:6), that of the great province on whose behalf it was fought (Gal. 2:5). The indications of the epistle are also more favourable to the South Galatian view. While its recipients had been generally heathen (4:8), they were not remote from Jewish influence, and knew the Law in its Jewish interpretation (4:21). They had been converted by Paul (4:12–15, 19) in company with Barnabas, as we should judge from the frequent references (2:1, 9, 13) rather than Silas, whose name is not mentioned. They had received Paul "as an angel

Indications of the epistle.

[1] The South Galatian theory was maintained by Renan, Weizsäcker, Hausrath, and others against Lightfoot, Lipsius, and other eminent authorities. Of late Professor Ramsay has given it important new support in his *Church in the Roman Empire*, 1893, and *Paul the Traveller*, 1896.

of God" on this occasion (4:14; cf. 1:8 and Acts 14:11), though his visit had been caused by an infirmity of the flesh, such as might occasion hasty retirement from the unhealthy coast to the mountainous interior (Acts 13:13), but would not naturally lead to toilsome journeys over the vast plains of the interior, *i.e.* Northern Galatia, with only here and there a city where the Apostle's language would be understood.[1]

It is then the same fickle multitude of Acts 14:8–20 which first received the Apostles as divine and next stoned them, of whose fickleness Paul has now again to complain; mongrel kinsmen of the same Jews whose persecutions drove him out thence (Acts 13:45, 14:19; cf. Gal. 6:12) are now by indirect influence seeking to filch from him the churches for whose liberty he suffers all.

Paul's opponents and their propaganda.

But the agitators who dogged his footsteps along the whole road from Antioch across Southern Galatia to Ephesus, Corinth, and finally to Rome,[2] were Christian Jews, at least in name (6:12; 2 Cor. 11:13, 22 f., Phil. 1:15); they called themselves "apostles of Christ," "ministers of Christ," and laid stress on having known him in the flesh, as against Paul's mere visions[3] (2 Cor. 5:12–17), and hinted that those "who were of repute," "pillars" in the mother church, had little sympathy with Paul. Their chief purpose was to maintain the prerogative of Israel in the Messianic kingdom (2 Cor. 11:22, Phil. 3:2) and the means

[1] The language of Central Galatia was still Celtic in Jerome's day.

[2] The traditional route of Gnosticism in the person of Simon Magus and his followers.

[3] See the anti-Pauline passage *Clem. Hom.* 17:19 (170–200 A.D.). Paul's vision of Jesus is compared to Balaam's, to whom the angel came "as an adversary" (Nu. 22:22 f.). His speaking of Peter as "condemned" (κατεγνωσμένος, as in Gal. 2.11), is contrasted with Jesus' calling him "blessed" (Matt. 16:17).

to this end was of course to induce Gentile converts to pass under the yoke of Mosaism. With this all motive for persecution would cease (Gal. 6:12). If possible, the Gentiles should be persuaded to be circumcised, though after the Jerusalem council (Acts 15:1–11, Gal. 2:1–10), this was no longer treated as essential, but as highly advantageous, on the plea that Paul himself still recommended it (Gal. 5:11; cf. Acts 16:3). Our epistle shows it to be only recommended for "perfection" (3:3). Afterward it seems to have been entirely dropped; for, with all their pretence of devotion to the Law the Judaisers did not scruple to take liberties of their own with its requirements (Gal. 6:13), and were well aware that modifications were indispensable to that religious empire over the Gentile world of which they dreamed.[1]

Were they "Jews from Asia"?

The immediate proximity of the Lycus valley, which Paul on his second visit had been dissuaded from entering (Acts 16:6), and which he subsequently found infested with a superstitious type of syncretistic Jewish-Christian theosophy (Colossians c. 2), suggests this as the derivation of the interloping Galatian Judaisers, and this has some support in the hint of Gal. 3:19, 4:1–3, 8–11, that they commended the Mosaic ritual as a proper honour to elemental Beings and angels, as was the case at Colossæ and Laodicea (Col. 2:1, 8–10, 16–20).[2]

[1] The missionary zeal of the Pharisees rivalled that of the Church in intensity (Matt. 23:15), and was by no means unready to make concessions, in particular as to circumcision (*Jos. Ant.* 20:2, 4) and the sacrificial system (Mk. 12:33). Their rage was excited by Paul's abolition of Jewish prerogative.

[2] For the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου see Everling, *Paulinische Angelologie und Dämonologie*, 1888, and E. Y. Hincks in *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.* 1896, and cf. Hermas *Vis.* 3:13, 3 with Rev. 4:6–9. The Preaching of Peter (Clem. *Strom.* 6:17) similarly declared the Jewish observance of Sabbaths, new-moons, and feasts to be

Whence had these interlopers the courage, after the signal defeat of their allies in Jerusalem, to renew their propaganda with far more vicious attacks on Paul's character, authority, and doctrine, and in Corinth even to display letters of commendation as "Apostles" from the older churches (2 Cor. 3:1; cf. 1 Cor. 9:1 f.)? Our best explanation is Paul's defence, including his own account of the controversy at Antioch, as to which, it would seem, he had hitherto observed the same silence as Luke (Acts 15:30–40).

Analysis of Galatians.

The epistle permits the following logical analysis: —

i. **Salutation** emphasising Paul's divine call and Gospel of a dying Christ, but without the usual thanksgiving, 1:1–5.

ii. **Thesis**: Paul's apostolic commission and antilegalistic doctrine are of divine authority, 1:6–10.

iii. **Proof.** 1. *Historical* (with principal stress on his apostleship), cc. 1, 2.

(1) From the circumstances of his conversion and independent missionary activity, 1:11–24.

(2) From his successful vindication of both; *a.* when challenged by "false brethren" at Jerusalem, 2:1–10; *b.* when endangered at Antioch by the weakness of Peter, 2:11–21.

2. *Doctrinal* (in demonstration of his Gospel), cc. 3, 4.

(1) From the outpouring of the Spirit, c. 3. *a.* Charismatic endowments were granted upon faith, not works. The Law produced curse. The blessing promised to Abraham came on abolition of the Law by Christ, and to *all* believers as a single body, 3:1–14.

a "worship of angels and archangels." Cf. Acts 7:42 with Just. M. *Dial.* 18, 19. For syncretistic Jewish-Christian Gnosticism see Harnack, *op. cit.*, p. 302, and Friedländer, *Vorchristliche Jüdische Gnosticismus*, 1898.

b. The Law was subsequent (v. 15), hence subordinate (17 f.), indirect and disciplinary (19–22), hence of temporary service to the Christ-heir (23–29).

(2) The condition of the legalist is one of relative slavery, 4 : 1–5 : 1. *a.* The adoption effected in Christ was a deliverance from tutelage (1–7), so that resort to Mosaism by Gentiles is equivalent to return to heathen ceremonial (8–11). Contrast with present conditions our tender relations at the time of your conversion (12–20). *b.* The Torah itself indicates this slavery of the legalist. If the inheritance were by fleshly descent it should go to Ishmael, the slave's son. Those who correspond to Isaac, the heir whose birth was effected by a promise (cf. Rom. 9 : 6–9), are free believers, children of the New Jerusalem, 4 : 21–5 : 1.

iv. **Practical Inferences**, cc. 5, 6. *Thesis:* The persuasion to legalism is a nullification of the Gospel, without support in my preaching (5 : 11) and uncalled for, 5 : 2–12.

(1) Because our spiritual freedom does not relax but heightens morality, 5 : 13–24.

(2) In particular its law of love calls for brotherly conduct (25 f.), and reciprocal service, of the erring by the spiritually gifted, and of the teacher by the taught, 6 : 1–6.

(3) Never imagine that it annuls the principle of retribution, 6 : 6–10.

v. **Autograph recapitulation and farewell.**

Contents.

Paul defended his apostleship, as we see, by appeal neither to the church in Antioch (Acts 13 : 1–4), as his assailants probably hoped he would, nor to the Twelve ; but proudly declared his calling to the office to have been, like Peter's, (1 : 12, οὐδὲ ἐγώ, 2 : 8 ; cf. Matt. 16 : 17) direct from God. Independent as he had been,

and consistent from the start in declaring the abolition of the dispensation of Mosaic Law with its distinction of Jew and Gentile, the Judæan churches had at first only gloried in his preaching the faith of which he once had made havoc (c. 1).

Then had come the plots of the "false brethren" against Gentile liberty, and his splendid vindication at Jerusalem by the very "pillars," James and Cephas and John, an agreement unmarred by a single reservation, for Paul himself had been as zealous as they in inculcating the duty of alms-giving, impossible for Jewish Christians to forget, *and they endorsed his Gospel of the uncircumcision absolutely* as committed to him by the grace of God (2:1–10).

The coincident testimony of Luke and Paul.

We cannot emphasise too strongly this positive statement of both Paul and Luke. Whatever else is stated to have occurred on this momentous occasion, neither Paul *nor the author of Acts* has any idea of admitting a difference in principle between Paul and any one of the three "pillars" as to the complete freedom of the Gentiles from any and all obligations of the Mosaic Law as such; cf. Gal. 2:15, 16, with Acts 15:11. The disagreement, as Paul is most careful to explain, arose subsequently and purely as a matter of practical application of the agreement.[1]

The Jerusalem agreement.

To avoid conflict it had been agreed that Paul should go to Gentile territory (of course not to the exclusion of individual Jews), and the rest to Jewish (of course

[1] Ramsay's attempt (*Paul*, 162 ff.) to invert the order of Gal. 2:1–10 and 11–14, identifying 2:1–10 with Acts 11:30, 12:25 is based on a misapprehension of the matter in question, viz. "eating with Gentiles," which must necessarily be subsequent to admitting them. Paul is not giving Peter a new idea in Gal. 2:16, but appealing to his professed principles (Acts 15:11). Another objection to Ramsay's view is the vacillatory conduct it would require us to impute to Barnabas.

not to the exclusion of individual Gentiles). The Jew should not be persuaded to give up the customs of his fathers (Acts 21:21) nor the Gentile to assume the yoke. So they parted, with a hearty right hand of fellowship, and Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch. Soon after came Peter thither, a further evidence of sympathy. But now an unforeseen contingency arose. In mixed churches like Antioch the agreement was inherently incompatible with fellowship. At the common table of the Church, either the Jew must Hellenise to the extent of "eating what was set before him, asking no questions for conscience sake" (1 Cor. 10:25), thus disregarding the Mosaic prohibition of "blood," and "things strangled," and "things offered to idols"; or the Gentile must Judaise to the extent of fencing his table from these "pollutions."

Its two possible interpretations.

To Paul there was no question as to which alternative should be adopted. From the beginning it had been his practice to be "as without the Law to them that are without," and as under it, to them that are under the Law (1 Cor. 9:20 f.). Christian consideration should lead the "strong" brother, who knows that "there is nothing unclean in itself," not to disregard the scruples of the "weak" (Romans, c. 14). If the Jewish Christian was thus protected from "compulsion" Paul had a right to expect reciprocally that no "compulsion" should be put upon the Gentile Christian. He and Peter, therefore, who "knew that a man is not justified by the works of the Law" (Gal. 2:16) should not stand upon their ceremonial "cleanness" when among Gentiles, "compelling them to Judaise" on pain of separation. To "do in Rome as the Romans do" was Paul's solution of the question how to regulate his diet in the different fields (1 Cor. 9:20 f.). Nor would Peter, the ardent, generous fisherman of Galilee, when left to himself,

be less liberal than his learned fellow-apostle. Hence Peter also "ate with the Gentiles."

Jewish Christian construction of the agreement.

But the "false brethren," though silenced at Jerusalem, could not leave unchallenged a construction of the agreement which, on occasion, would release *Jews* from the obligation of the Law. Hence there soon appeared in Antioch, doubtless on their complaint to Jerusalem, a second delegation "from James" (Gal. 2:12), implying a *second* assembly in Jerusalem, to which must be referred most of what in Acts 15:19–35 is mistakenly related as of the *first* (but cf. 21:25). In deference to these demands not only Peter, but "the rest of the Jews," including even Barnabas, "drew back and separated themselves." Paul accused them publicly of "compelling the Gentiles to Judaise." Does he mean that they now attempted to repudiate the great concession made at Jerusalem, and reimpose the law? That would be inconceivably childish, especially for Barnabas. No, but conversely with Paul his Jewish friends felt that unless rules were laid down governing the eating of Christian Jews when among Gentile brethren, the Gentile Christian would be "compelling" his Jewish brother "to Hellenise." Hence "the elder brethren" in Jerusalem, applying in the absence of Peter and Paul what they conceived to be implied in the agreement, prescribed *for mixed communities* (Acts 15:23) abstinence from pollutions *which would involve the Jew*.[1] This well-meant, but to Paul intolerable, attempt

[1] It is a common error to suppose that eating with Gentiles is to the Jew unlawful *per se*. The strictest Jew may eat with a Gentile if the latter's table is guarded from "pollutions." When the unforeseen case of mixed communities arose, the Jerusalem authorities assumed this to be a "necessary" corollary of the agreement. In reality it was impracticable. Paul went as far toward adjusting Gentile tables to Jewish suscepti-

to construe the agreement, constitutes the substance of the so-called "Jerusalem decrees," the enactment of which Paul explicitly denies, for the occasion of Acts 15:1–12 = Gal. 2:1–10; so that their introduction in Acts 15:13–35 is premature. Indeed, in the nature of the case, they could not *precede* Peter's vacillation at Antioch, for three of the decrees prescribe just the terms on which he might "eat with the Gentiles." The fourth, the prohibition of fornication, is intended to remove an obstacle to fellowship of a different kind. It must be understood literally as a reënforcement of the incredible laxity of Gentile morality. Its pertinence appears from the emphasis which Paul himself lays upon it in the same manner and the same connection (1 Thess. 4:3–8; Gal. 5:20; 1 Cor. 6:12–20). To suppose that the Apostles would have wantonly interfered with the marital relations of Gentile families is to regard them as insane fanatics.

Purpose of the "decrees."

Thus the course of events which led up to the great breach between Paul and the older Apostles, and so colours all his later career, was as follows: After the evangelisation of Galato-Phrygia, reactionaries in Antioch objected, but met complete discomfiture on reference of the question to Jerusalem. Paul and Barnabas returned to Antioch accompanied by Peter (not "Judas and Silas," Acts 15:22). Disregard of the law here by Peter and the Jews for the sake of fraternisation was made the occasion of a *second* complaint at Jerusalem drawing thence the delegation (Judas and Silas?) and the decrees in application of the compact, to which all the Jews at Antioch save Paul gave in.

The more completely Paul found himself in the

bilities as was practicable when he directed the "strong" brother to abstain when in his presence the "weak" (scrupulous) declared, "This hath been offered to an idol" (1 Cor. 10:14–33).

Paul's second stand for Gentile liberty at Antioch.

minority the more unsparing was he in his remorseless logic and his determination to make a second stand against Peter, Barnabas, the delegation from James, and all "the rest of the Jews" "that the truth of the Gospel might continue with" his Gentile converts. In a public meeting of the Church (ἔμπροσθεν πάντων) he charged Peter himself with a betrayal of both the agreement (ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαίζειν) and of his own acknowledged principles (vs. 16). He does not hesitate to impute to him in this letter both cowardice and "hypocrisy" (vs. 12 f.).[1]

Consequent separation from the elder brethren.

We need no other explanation why Paul thenceforth no longer depends either on Jerusalem or Antioch as his missionary base; why he is separated from Barnabas, his old companion (Acts 15:39); why the Judaisers no longer scruple to undermine his influence, attack his character and apostleship, proselytise his converts, and even guardedly recommend circumcision. We understand why Paul on his part makes no further appeal to the Apostles or older churches to put a stop to their machinations, why, after ten years of unsupported missionary labour when his great peace-offering (Rom. 15:16) of the churches of the Greek world is at last ready, and he is about to go up to Jerusalem bearing the rich evidence that he had indeed taught them to "remember the poor," he even doubts whether "the ministration which he has for Jerusalem will be acceptable to the saints," scarcely venturing to expect that he can be "delivered from them that are disobedient in Judæa" (Rom. 15:30 f.). We only wonder

[1] And Loman, Steck, Van Manen, and others maintain that this was *forged*, yet in spite of all was shortly after accepted as Pauline *by churches which revered both Apostles*, including those to which it falsely purported to have been sent! We cannot believe that even Paul himself a year or two later would have written as he has in Gal. 2:12 f.

at the Christian forbearance which on both sides went so far to heal the breach. For here is Paul on his part, at the first opportunity, even circumcising Timothy to conciliate "the Jews that were in those parts" (Galatia, Acts 16:3),[1] and subsequently in his letters to his churches so insisting upon those two of the decrees which had a real moral foundation as almost to conflict with his principle that even abstinence from εἰδωλόθυτα is a *voluntary* concession to the scruples of the weak (Rom. c. 14; 1 Cor. 6:12 ff.; 8:1–11:1). We find him in all his quarrel with the "supereminent Apostles" speaking with only respect and honour of Peter, Barnabas, James, and the Twelve (1 Cor. 3:22; 9:5 f.; 15:1–11), and in Ephesians, after the visit to Jerusalem, he is brimming over with the glad consciousness that the enmity between Jew and Gentile is "slain," the wall of division in the new temple of God broken down; nay, in his vision, the very foundation of the now united Church is "the consecrated Apostles and Prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the head stone of the corner" (2:20). On the other side there was also generosity. Beyond the immediate circle of Antiochian churches for which the decrees were enacted ("Antioch, Syria and Cilicia," Acts 15:23) there is no evidence of their promulgation,[2] and even the passages which relate to them in Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25, in the Western text have been transformed into mere moral requirements.[3] At Ephe-

With mutual respect.

The later rule of the Church.

[1] McGiffert in dating Galatians *before* Paul's departure from Antioch (Acts 15:36 ff.) is of course obliged to reject Acts 16:3 as unhistorical; cf. Gal. 5:2.

[2] The statement of Acts 16:4 not only is preposterous in view of the above, but conflicts with the address of the letter (15:23).

[3] It reads in vs. 29, "To abstain from things offered to idols and blood (*i.e.* violence) and fornication, and not to do to another the things ye would not should happen to yourselves"; cf. Διδ. 1:2.

sus a generation later the author of Rev. 2:14, 20, whether John the Apostle, or only some representative of Palestinian Christianity, deems himself absolutely loyal to the great founder of the churches of Asia in insisting upon those two of the decrees, *and those only* (v. 24, cf. Acts 15:28), to which Paul himself had demanded obedience — not indeed as decrees, but on moral grounds. A few years later still we find the same requirement put forward by the Church at large. Διδ. 6:3, after a prohibition of fornication, directs, "As concerning meats, bear what thou art able; yet abstain at all events from meat sacrificed to idols; for it is the worship of dead gods" (cf. 1 Cor. 10:20 f.).

Results of the Galatian crisis.

We may not have the direct language of Peter in 1 Peter, nor of James in James, the former Pauline to the core, the latter a well-meant interpretation of Paulinism; but if Mk. 7:1–19 and Acts 10:9–16; 11:3–10, are not Petrine in source it would be hard to find what might be so termed, and here Paul's demand is conceded both in principle and in practice, though in Acts anachronistically, and elsewhere, too, not always with clear appreciation of Paul's point of view. But in general we may say: What might be expected to happen when Paul carried his olive branches to Jerusalem after the ten years of misunderstanding and estrangement, is substantially what we find related in Acts 21:17–28, including the attack of the "Jews from (Proconsular) Asia"; for while Paul's differences with the older Apostles never involved a principle, and could not fail to give way to the spirit manifested in Rom. 15:25–33, there was in all the region from Antioch to Ephesus an element of bitter, implacable hatred, from the time that he had openly denounced the second attempt of the Judaisers to employ the authority of the Jerusalem

Church against him. It must be confessed that the letter to the Galatian churches was not of a type to conciliate them (Gal. 1 : 10). To the legalists it was, in fact, a declaration of open war, and not altogether one-sided in strength, since Paul had deprived himself of his best allies by his harshness to Peter and Barnabas. Of its effect on the Galatians we have only hints, but most happy ones, in 1 Cor. 16 : 1 and Acts 20 : 4, where the delegation charged with the offering at Jerusalem includes Gaius of Derbe and Timothy of Lystra.

The correspondence with Thessalonica.

If Paul's two letters to Thessalonica were also of the year 50, as we have assumed, but a few weeks or months later than Galatians, we should expect them to show some echo of the conflict. It is true that the Judaisers seem never to have penetrated Macedonia (Phil. 1 : 3) and the same motives which led to the drawing of a veil over the painful scenes at Antioch would exclude the subject now, if possible. Unconsciously, however, the Apostle's tone might be expected to betray here and there his emotion. Such traces appear indeed to be present; but they are few,[1] for another subject engrosses him.

Unlike Galatians and Romans, the letters to Thessalonica and Corinth form part of a correspondence, so that logical form is often superseded by the sequence of the letter, or other information, to which Paul is

[1] We mention only 1 Thess. 2 : 4 (cf. Gal. 1 : 10) ; 2 : 15 (cf. Gal. 6 : 12), 3 : 7 f. (Gal. 4 : 19) ; 1 : 5 ff. (Gal. 6 : 7) ; 2 Thess. 3 : 2 f. (Gal. 1 : 7 ; 3 : 1 ; 4 : 17 ; 5 : 7–12) ; 2 Thess. 3 : 13 (Gal. 6 : 9). One of the counts against the genuineness of 2 Thess. has been its undue suspicion of unscrupulous enemies, 2 : 2, 15 ; 3 : 17. Paul's own previous letter, distorted by report, was probably the only objective factor: cf. 1 Thess. 5 : 27, and see Jülicher, *Einleitung*[3], p. 41, but after the Galatian episode he had cause to distrust "false brethren."

replying. The order of 1 and 2 Thessalonians is as follows: —

Analysis of 1 Thess.

i. **Answer to the Thessalonians' letter,** cc. 1–3.

(1) Salutation, and epistolary thanksgiving and prayer, 1:1, 2–10.

(2) Defence against Jewish (2:15 f.) charges that the "Apostles" (vs. 6) were self-seeking deceivers, 2:1–12.

(3) Reciprocation of the Thessalonians' thanksgiving for "the word of the message" in praise to God for their steadfastness under Jewish persecution, 2:13–16.

(4) Why Paul had been unable to revisit them, and was compelled instead to send Timothy, whose report just received on his return is a great relief. Until able to come in person, Paul commends them to God, 2:17–20; 3:1–5, 6–10, 11–13.

ii. **Exhortation to further Progress,** cc. 4, 5.

(1) In Christian morality, (*a*) regarding sexual purity, 4:1–8; (*b*) regarding the manifestation of love in reciprocal service and industry, 9–12.

(2) In doctrine, (*a*) as to the participation of deceased friends in the Messianic resurrection, 4:13–18; (*b*) as to the sudden coming of Christ, 5:1–11.

(3) In administration of church affairs, 5:12–22.

(4) Blessing and farewell, 5:23–28.

Analysis of 2 Thess.

A reply to 1 Thessalonians was soon received by Paul, to which 2 Thessalonians makes answer as follows: —

Supplementary Letter

(1) Salutation and thanksgiving reciprocating[1] that of the Thessalonians, 1:1, 2, 3–12.

[1] From 1:4 it appears that the corresponding element of the Thessalonians' letter had deprecated Paul's praise (1 Thess. 1:4–10; 2:14). *They* should glory in *Paul*. From 1:11 it is

(2) Correction of current misinterpretations of Paul's doctrine of the *Parousia;* evil must first culminate; expression of confidence and blessing, 2:1–12, 13–15, 16–17.

(3) Concluding exhortation, 3:1–15. (*a*) General approval, 1–5; (*b*) reënforcement of the previous admonition to church discipline in view of reported insubordination, 6–15.

(4) Blessing and autograph farewell, 3:16, 17–18.

Occasion of 1 Thess.

In 1 Thessalonians Paul is replying to a letter[1] just received by the hand of Timothy, whom he had sent back from Athens after receiving his report of the trials the infant church was undergoing, to comfort them (1 Thess. 3:1–5). A fuller account of the circumstances can be had by comparing the slightly discrepant statements of Acts 17:1–10; 18:1, 5 with 1 Thess. 1:1, 5, 7, 8; 2:9; 3:1–6.[2] A promised visit had been frustrated, the persecuting Jews making the fact a basis for slander which Paul must meet. Timothy's report had been highly encouraging (3:6 f.), though there is room "to perfect that which is lacking in their faith." Morally Paul urges only the matter of purity and the general obligation of love and mutual helpfulness (4:1–12). Doctrinally they as Greeks are naturally in need of explanation of his teaching as to the bodily resurrection (cf. 1 Cor. c. 15), deaths

Doctrinal element.

clear that they had assured him of their prayers in his behalf, as requested 1 Thess. 5:25.

[1] See the art. by R. Harris in *Expositor*, January, 1899, and note the καὶ ἡμεῖς 1 Thess. 2:13.

[2] Acts gives a wrong impression (i) of the proportion of Jews, a result of the author's pragmatism; (ii) of the time spent (17:2); cf. Phil. 4:16, and the evidences of development in 1 Thess. 2:8–11, 17–20; 3:5–10; (iii) Acts 17:14–16; 18:5 omits a journey of Timothy to Athens and back; cf. 1 Thess. 3:1–6.

having occurred in the church. Paul appeals to the teaching of Jesus (Matt. 10:39?) regarding the equal share in the kingdom of those who die before the Second Coming, following this with a typical Jewish representation of the scenes of the Judgment Day, which will overtake the unbelieving world as a thief (Lk. 12:39 f.; 17:26–30; Rev. 3:3). Christians will watch and be sober, not taken unaware, however sudden the Coming of the Lord. Concluding exhortations look especially to church discipline and the moderation of a somewhat inflammatory "spirit of prophecy."

Occasion of 2 Thess.

A further link in the correspondence is 2 Thessalonians; for while the amanuensis may have been different,[1] the senders (Paul, Silas, and Timothy) are the same, and the situation merely a little later in time, enough for word back and forth (1:11; 3:1, 4).[2]

The opening thanksgiving and prayer[3] (combined as in 1 Thess. 1:2; Col. 1:3, 9; Eph. 1:3 ff., 15; Phil. 1:3 f.) are for the continued growth of the church in faith and love, despite persistent persecution. They foreshadow, characteristically, the main subject, the Day of the Lord.

Doctrinal content.

The main occasion of the letter appears in c. 2. The notion was current "whether through spirit (*i.e.* utterance of a local 'prophet'; cf. 1 Thess. 5:19 f.), or report, or letter purporting to be from those with

[1] Slight peculiarities of language are noted, as εὐχαριστεῖν ὀφείλομεν 1:3; 2:13, for εὐχαριστοῦμεν 1 Thess. 1:2; 2:13, κύριος for θεός in a few formulæ, etc.

[2] We may date 2 Thess. about the end of 50 A.D. Corinth is already the centre of a group of churches (1:4, cf. 2 Cor. 1:1; Rom. 16:1) and opposition is high (3:2), but Gallio's decision (Acts 18:12) does not come within view.

[3] Note again the significant and inimitable ὥστε αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐνκαυχᾶσθαι. The Thessalonians had written that they boasted of the Apostles against the slanderers; cf. 2 Cor. 1:14.

Paul" (2:2), that the Day of the Lord had already begun[1] (cf. 1 Thess. 2:16; Jn. 3:19–21; 12:31). Paul suspects misrepresentation (ἐξαπατήσῃ). He enters, therefore, more into the particulars of his eschatology, qualifying the warnings of 1 Thessalonians as to the suddenness of the Coming, by interjecting the Jewish doctrine of Antichrist, whose work must first reach its culmination. If this constitutes a contradiction of 1 Thessalonians it is not more so than the qualification in Lk. 21:7–33, and parallels, of the warning against being taken unaware in Lk. 17:26–30; 21:34–36, and parallels. Both are elements of the Lord's teaching. The section closes with an exhortation to stand by the traditions taught them (cf. 1 Thess. 4:15), "whether by word, or epistle of ours."

Practical content.

The practical section (c. 3) lays increased emphasis on repression of the disorders of 1 Thess. 4:11 f.; 5:14, advancing from general exhortation to specific command (2 Thess. 3:4, 6, 12). The drones who receive church support in return for inflammatory "prophecies" are "commanded" to follow Paul's example of industry (1 Thess. 2:9–12). Disobedience is to be visited with church discipline. The autograph farewell is the token of authenticity in every letter.[2]

Genuineness of 2 Thess.

Of all the earlier epistles of Paul, 2 Thessalonians alone admits a reasonable doubt of genuineness in the judgment of modern critics.[3] External evidence proves

[1] "Just at hand," Am. R. V., hardly expresses ἐνέστηκεν; cf. 2 Tim. 2:18.

[2] References to the previous letter (2:2, 15; 3:13 (?)) or letters (3:17) show that Paul's correspondence with his churches did not begin with 1 Thess. or even with Gal. (cf. 2 Cor. 11:28), though with Gal. they may well have assumed a vastly increased importance.

[3] A post-Pauline imitation of 1 Thess. in the judgment of Hilgenfeld, Weizsäcker, Holtzmann, *et al.* Defended by Jülicher, and many others.

it indeed to have been in existence at least as early as 117 A.D. and universally acknowledged in 138, which precludes the date under Trajan assumed by Hilgenfeld and a few radicals. But if we place the date before 70 A.D., as is reasonably certain from 2:4, it is conceivable that a Christian apocalyptist might aim to modify Paul's eschatology in 1 Thessalonians in the direction suggested by the reign and death of Nero, and martyrdom of the Apostle.[1] The style is admittedly Pauline and the language not un-Pauline, but this can be accounted for as due to the large element of reproduction of 1 Thessalonians. The subject (1:5–10; 2:1–12) and the appeals to apostolic tradition and command (2:15; 3:4, 6, 14) are readily adaptable to such a theory, while the distinctly sharper tone of authority than in 1 Thessalonians may also be so explained.[2] But the principal objections to the genuineness are two: (i) 2 Thess. 2:2, if the epistle were genuine, would prove the circulation during Paul's lifetime of spurious letters, which is admitted to be highly improbable. (ii) The eschatology is said to be un-Pauline.

Principal objections.

Reply.

But (i) 2 Thess. 2:2 does not prove the *existence* of spurious letters, but, at most, of the *suspicion* in Paul's mind of such a possibility,[3] which as Jülicher has pointed out would be easily accounted for by dis-

[1] So Schmiedel in Holtzmann's *Handbuch*.

[2] Spitta (*Gesch. u. Litt. d. Urchr.*, p. 137) suggests a different amanuensis — a reasonable explanation of the phrases above noted (p. 74 n. 1). The sharper tone is quite as likely to be due to historical conditions; cf. 2 Cor. 10–13 with 1 Cor. 9. It certainly proves 2 Thess. the later of the two (against Grotius, Bunsen, Ewald, *et al.*). From 3:11, 14 (?) it might be inferred that the Thessalonian church authorities had *requested* this support from the Apostle toward the carrying out of his exhortation, 1 Thess. 5:14.

[3] Perhaps not a more serious suspicion than in Gal. 1:8.

torted reports of what was taught in the genuine letter (cf. 1 Thess. 1 : 10; 2 : 16; 4 : 13–17).

Objection (ii) borrows much of its force from a now discredited method of treating apocalypse. Gunkel and Bousset have shown that the true key to its symbolism is not to be found in the allegorising of current events, but in the *adaptation* of a stereotyped, in all essential elements pre-Christian material. The "little apocalypse," 2 Thess. 2 : 3–12, is un-Pauline in precisely the same way that the "little apocalypse" of Matt. ch. 24 and parallels is un-Christian.[1]

Apocalyptic ideas of Jesus and Paul.

It does not follow that Paul and Jesus did not take up such elements of current belief in which they had been nurtured since childhood, even alongside of new principles which to moderns seem more or less incongruous. It is undeniable that they showed this natural mental hospitality in the sphere of angelology and demonology; why not in eschatology? But more; we may rightly deny that any incompatibility of thought exists between 2 Thess. 2 : 3–12 and the Pauline eschatology of 1 Thessalonians or elsewhere, and fairly affirm that no date subsequent to Paul's death will so well account for the representation of 2 Thess. 2 : 3–12 as 50–51 A.D.

Antichrist in 2 Thess.

We need not assume with Hitzig in vs. 6 f. a play upon the name Claudius (=*qui claudit*, he who restrains), nor deny that "the restrainer" may well be a primeval element of the Antichrist legend; but in the present application of the word, first neuter, then masculine, the reference is certainly to Paul's unfailing refuge against Jewish malice and persecution, the usually incorruptible Roman magistracy (Rom. 13 : 1–6), which at this very period was signally befriending him (Acts 18 : 12–17). The savage persecution of

[1] Cf. "Belial" 2 Cor. 6 : 15 with 2 Thess. 2 : 3, 4, and see E. Haupt *Eschat. Aussagen Jesu*, 1895.

Nero, in which both Peter and Paul were victims, at least according to early belief, was a thunderbolt from the clear sky, which struck the Church dumb with horror and completely transformed its conception of the Empire (cf. Rev. 6:9–11; 7:14; 14:8; 16:19; 18:24). A representation of Rome as a *protecting* power, "restraining" Belial, even temporarily, is inconceivable after July 64 A.D.

Results as to date.

Similarly with the "mystery of lawlessness," the Antichrist whose lying "signs and wonders" will lead to the great apostacy among the elect people (Israel), so that, as a parody of the true Messiah, he shall sit in the temple at Jerusalem, receiving divine honours. We may admit a possible tincture of the language by the frightful experience of Paul's fatherland in Caligula's insane attempt to erect his statue there for worship (39–40 A.D.; cf. 1 Thess. 2:16), but the elements are pure, stereotyped Jewish apocalyptic tradition (cf. Matt. 24:15, 24, 30 and parallels, and Rev. cc. 13, 17; 2 Esdr. 13:10 f.; Διδ. 16 etc.). But it is no less certain that the author presupposes the continued existence of "the Jerusalem that now is" (Gal. 4:25; cf. Rev. 11:1–8) and its visible temple, at least until the culmination of the power of Antichrist, than that the centre of gravity for the entire power of evil is Jewish and purely Jewish. The antithesis is between the earthly Jerusalem under the mastery of Belial and apostate Israel (vss. 3, 10–12),[1] and the heavenly Jerusalem, revealed at the coming of Jesus (Phil. 3:20). Rome plays a subordinate part. Surely the Pauline disciple who between 65

[1] Cf. Rev. 11:8; Rom. 11:11–14, 23–32 supplements this doctrine of the rejection of all but the "remnant" of Israel with the hopeful paradox of the provocation to jealousy of the rest; but this looks beyond the point reached in 2 Thess. and itself is probably an adaptation of apocalyptic tradition.

and 70 A.D. could *so* readjust the eschatology of the great Apostle would be an extraordinary phenomenon. And then, in addition, to procure the acceptance of his forgery in the churches! And this in spite of the fact that within a year or two events had given the lie to his expectation (2 : 4).

Forgery highly improbable.

In spite of all ingenuity, no historical setting has yet been framed to account for 2 Thessalonians, whether as a unit, or as a combination of Pauline with post-Pauline elements[1] so free from serious objection to an impartial judgment as the view supported by its own representation and by the unbroken tradition of antiquity, that it was written by Paul from Corinth in answer to the reply from Thessalonica to 1 Thessalonians,[2] and aims to remove certain misconstructions of the same. The present tendencies of criticism are all in favour of this view.

[1] So P. W. Schmidt (*Prot. Bibel*), Davidson (*Introd.* i, p. 347), Hase (*Kirchengesch.* i, 1885, p. 284). Schmiedel (*loc. cit.*) acknowledges the futility of division theories.

[2] Observe 1 : 4, 11 (?) ; 3 : 1, and the relation above noted of 3 : 11, 14 to 1 Thess. 5 : 14 followed by 2 Thess. 3 : 6–15.

In addition to *Introductions*, *Lives of Paul*, etc., see Ramsay's *Historical Commentary on Galatians*, 1899 ; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, [10] 1890 ; J. Weiss, *Apostelgesch.*, 1898 ; Lightfoot's art. in Smith's *B. D.*, "Second Thess." ; and Farrar, *Paul*, ii, Exc. 1. For the genuineness of Paul's epistles see especially Knowling, *The Witness of the Epistles*. Jowett (*The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans,* 1856) and Ellicott, (*Galatians* 1854, [4] 1867, *Thessalonians* 1865) have special commentaries of value. The consecutive vols. of Meyer's great *Commentary* on the books of the N. T. (Engl. 1887) contain each, *Introductions*. Holtzmann's *Hand-Commentar* is unfortunately untranslated. Less thorough are those of the English serial commentaries, the *Cambridge Greek Testament* 1887–, etc.

CHAPTER IV

THE EPISTLES OF THE FIRST PERIOD: THE CORRESPONDENCE WITH CORINTH AND LETTER TO ROME

1 and 2 Cor. and Rom.

THE letters of the period between Paul's two departures from Corinth, after his first and after his last visit, present problems of a predominantly historical character. Their authenticity is practically undisputed. Romans can be shown to have been known not only to Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp, but even to the authors of 1 Peter, Hebrews, and James.[1] 1 Corinthians is almost equally well known from the very beginning, and, as we saw, is spoken of by Clement of Rome as written by Paul to the Corinthians. 2 Corinthians appears to have come into circulation later, but is equally unassailable. Critics differ only as to the circumstances of writing, and as to whether in 2 Corinthians and Romans, fragments of other letters of Paul may not have been editorially taken up.

Character of the Achaian church.

The special interest of the author of Acts leads him to drop the whole subject of Paul's missionary activity in Achaia as soon as the inevitable breach with the

[1] Thus Rom. 9 : 25 = 1 Pet. 2 : 10, Rom. 9 : 32 f. = 1 Pet. 2 : 6–8, Rom. 12 : 1 = 1 Pet. 2 : 5, Rom. 12 : 2 = 1 Pet. 1 : 14. We have reproductions of the thought of Rom. 12 : 3–6, 9 f., 16–18, 13 : 1–7 in 1 Pet. 4 : 7–11 ; 1 : 22 ; 3 : 8, 9, 11; 2 : 13–17. Heb. 11 : 11 f., 19 and 10 : 30 depend on Rom. 4 : 17–21 and 12 : 19. Rom. 2 : 1, 13 ; 4 : 1, 20 ; 5 : 3–5 ; 7 : 23, and 13 : 12 recur in Jas. 4 : 11 ; 1 : 22 ; 2 : 21 ; 1 : 6, 2–4 ; 4 : 1, and 1 : 21.

synagogue takes place (18:6; cf. 13:46, etc.), and the Apostle is thus compelled to "turn to the Gentiles." Hence, while it is clear from the epistles (1 Cor. 12:2) that this group of churches, including perhaps even Athens, as well as Cenchreæ and other neighbouring towns (1 Cor. 1:2; 2 Cor. 1:1), was predominantly of Gentile origin, the converts mentioned in Acts 18:1–18 include not one Gentile, not even those whom Paul had personally baptised (perhaps in the early period before the coming of Silas and Timothy, Acts 18:5), not even "the household of Stephanas, the firstfruits of Achaia" (1 Cor. 1:14–16; 16:15). On the other hand, the epistles give even more unmistakable evidence than Acts of the usual leaven of Jews and Jewish Christians, with the troubles occasioned at first by the former (Acts 18: 12–17; cf. 20:3), afterward by the latter (2 Cor. cc. 10–13).

Its early history.

Begun under a special sense of personal insufficiency (1 Cor. 2:1–5), Paul's work among the mixed population of the great heathen city[1] had proved exceptionally fruitful (1:4–7; cf. Acts 18:8–11), though among the humbler classes (1:26), and against strenuous opposition (1 Thess. 2:15 f.; 2 Thess. 3:2; cf. Acts 18:6, 12–17). His earliest allies were a certain Aquila and Prisca (Acts, "Priscilla"), a Jewish couple whom he encountered on his arrival, recently expelled from Rome under an edict of Claudius, which Orosius dates in 49 A.D.[2] This couple, if not owing their conversion itself to Paul, became his permanent helpers, not merely in evangelisation, but in the manual labour by which the Apostle eked out the scanty aid of the infant and persecuted churches of Macedonia; for he would suffer no man to say he had

[1] See *B. D.*, "Corinth."

[2] Probably an error for fifty. See Ramsay, *Paul*, p. 254.

taken money from those he was seeking to evangelise (2 Cor. 11:7–12). But Jewish malice was effectually frustrated by Gallio, the high-minded and courteous brother of Seneca, who would seem to have reached his province about May,[1] 51 A.D. The charge they immediately brought against Paul before him appears to have been that of propagating a cult unrecognised by Roman law; for they argue from their Scriptures that the new doctrine has no claim to the legal privileges of Judaism. Gallio, with all a philosopher's contempt for religious persecution, and a lawyer's for pettifogging, summarily quashed the complaint, and permitted the crowd its own emphatic approval of the verdict.[2] Thus, when Paul, shortly after, with Prisca and Aquila, took his leave of the church where he had laboured for eighteen months (Acts 18:11) all outward circumstances were propitious. Subsequent events must explain to us the painful conditions so clearly exhibited in the letters.

Date of 1 Cor.

Paul writes from Ephesus (1 Cor. 16:8). Between two and three years have elapsed (Acts 18:22 f.; 19:8–10; 20:31); for his work there is nearly done, and his journey to Jerusalem with the great offering of his churches is already planned (1 Cor. 16:1–6). It is shortly before Passover (5:7 f.), but Paul will stay until Pentecost, because of great exigencies and opportunities. The plan is the same as that of 2 Cor. 1:15–2:1; 9:4 f., the same as actually carried out (Acts 19:21 f.; 20:1–3). It appears from 2 Cor.

[1] Ramsay, *Expositor*, V, 5, p. 205.

[2] The Sosthenes whose unlucky conduct of the case against Paul brought retribution from the bystanders must then either be a wholly different person from Paul's friend (1 Cor. 1:1), or his flogging must have led to a very surprising change of heart. More probably there is a confusion of names in Acts 18:17 occasioned by vs. 8.

1:15 ff. to have been the substitute for an earlier plan, involving a double visit in Corinth, which Paul for his own reasons had changed. Unless we suppose, therefore, a change and a change back again,[1] the alteration was in a plan which preceded our 1 Corinthians,[2] and this is the more probable from the apologetic tone of 1 Cor. 16:5–9, especially verse 7. It is, therefore, early spring of 54 A.D., and Paul has not been in Corinth since his departure in the fall of 51;[3] for all his information is at second hand. Direct knowledge would certainly appear if he had himself visited the church.

Events in Corinth since Paul's departure.

In the meantime, during Paul's absence among the scenes of his earlier missionary labours, Prisca and Aquila had met at Ephesus an Alexandrian Jewish Christian, named Apollos, of great learning and brilliancy (Acts 18:22–24 ; 19:1), and, after indoctrinating him with Pauline views, had commended him to the church in Corinth, where his work prospered in the extension of the church, as well as in the refutation of the Jews (1 Cor. 3:10–15; Acts 18:24–28). But at the time of our epistle, Apollos has come back to Ephesus and is with Paul; he even declines to return to Corinth, though Paul himself seconds their invitation (1 Cor. 16:12). This is one source of Paul's information concerning the church. Further reports, by no means favourable, had come through "the household of Chloe" (1:11), whose residence had perhaps been transferred from Corinth to Ephesus.

[1] Various combinations of 2 Cor. 1:15 with 12:14, 20, 21; 13:1 are tried by Schmiedel *et al.* to make 1 Cor. 16:5–7 appear the original plan.

[2] Communicated in the letter mentioned 1 Cor. 5:9 or through Timothy.

[3] Implied in 2:1. Many infer a visit from 2 Cor. 2:1, 12:14, 21 ; 13:1, 2, but the margin (R. V.) gives the true meaning.

But there had been direct communication as well. A previous letter from the Apostle had been sent to warn the church against fellowship with fornicators (5:9). Paul is now in receipt of the reply, whose bearers, Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, are still with him (16:17 f.); but it is far from satisfactory on the point of discipline involved, while asking light on several other problems, which Paul ultimately discusses seriatim. Before this, however, he deals with the abuses of which report has reached him, and which have become so serious as to require the sending of Timothy in advance of his own coming, though the letter is expected to reach them first of all (4:17–21; 16:10 f.). The twofold occasion for the letter is thus as clearly indicated as we have found its date. It appears in the sharp division at 7:1, "Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote." In the latter half, accordingly, the order will be simply that of the Corinthians' questions, which are probably answered seriatim. As a whole, the letter yields the following analysis:—

Occasion and analysis of 1 Cor.

i. **Salutation and Thanksgiving,** 1:1–3; 4–9.

ii. **Rebuke of the Evils reported to Paul by Visitors from Corinth,** 1:10–6:20.

1. *Factiousness,* 1:10–4:21. *a.* The four party cries, 1:10–17. *b.* Paul in his personal method had been indifferent to philosophical elaboration of the message, though able so to apply it as to solve mysteries, 1:18–2:5; 2:6–16. *c.* Simple teaching was, and still is, better adapted to their undeveloped condition; the building of Apollos or others on Paul's substructure must be judged by its stability, 3:1–9, 10–15. *d.* Destructive rather is the factious exaltation of one teacher and depreciation of another, 3:16–23; 4:1–5. *e.* Application to himself and

Apollos, whose spirit is far different from that of the party leaders. A threat against the usurpers, 4:6–13, 14–21.

2. *Immorality and Litigiousness*, cc. 5, 6. *a.* A case of incest tolerated, 5:1–8. *b.* The excuse of misunderstanding Paul's previous letter removed, 9–13. *c.* Litigation between Christians a disgrace; still more the wrong-doing. Our freedom not libertinism, 6:1–11. *d.* Eating of εἰδωλόθυτα and fornication an abuse of the principle "all things are lawful," 12–20.

iii. **Reply to the Enquiries of the Corinthians' Letter, cc. 7–16.**

1. *Celibacy, Marriage, and Separation* (in further explanation of the requirement, 2 Cor. 6:14 f.?), c. 7.

2. *Things sacrificed to Idols* (further explaining 2 Cor. 6:16–7:1?), 8:1–11:1. *a.* Those superior to dietetic scruples must not forget the duty of consideration for the weak, c. 8. *b.* Reply to those who question his authority and practice. Paul's principle of accommodation, c. 9. *c.* But Christians who commit fornication and join in temple feasts repeat the sin into which Israel was led by Balaam at Baal-peor (Num. 25:1 ff.). However, it is not necessary outside the temples to enquire whether the meat was sacrificial or not, unless to avoid stumbling a weak brother, 10:1–11:1.

3. *Order in Church Meetings*, 11:2–14:40. *a.* Propriety in female costume, 11:2–16. *b.* Social cliques at the love-feasts, with the resulting inequalities of food and drink, grossly interfere with proper observance afterward of the sacrament, 17–34. *c.* The various charismata must be mutually subordinated. The spectacular endowments ("tongues," "prophecy") are temporary; faith, hope, love, the abiding gifts. Good order, conducing to edification, the rule, under

which "prophecy" appears superior to "tongues," cc. 12–14.

4. *Explanation of the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body,* c. 15. *a.* The deniers of bodily resurrection refuted, 1–34. *b.* The spiritual body not the old flesh resuscitated, vss. 35–58.

5. *Business Arrangements and Farewells,* c. 16. *a.* The collection for Jerusalem, vss. 1–4. *b.* A postponement of Paul's visit, 5–9. *c.* Timothy's impending arrival. Apollos declines for the present the invitation, 10–12. *d.* Personal farewells, 13–24.

Occasion and analysis of 2 Cor.

Just what occurred in Corinth after receipt of this letter is a subject of difficult and varied conjecture, but at the point where our documents resume Paul is apparently writing in response to the Corinthians' messages expressive of profound repentance and renewed loyalty, sent by Titus (7:6–11), and as his *fourth* letter in the correspondence, our 2 Corinthians, with the following content: —

i. **Salutation and Thanksgiving** for the divine comfort, especially in view of Paul's recent narrow escape from death, 1:1–11.

ii. **Explanations** of certain features of Paul's letters and conduct which had given offence, and expression of satisfaction for the reparation made, 1:11–2:4, 5–11.

iii. **Paul's Present Circumstances and Disposition,** 2:12–7:16.

a. His arrival in Macedonia from Troas, and rejoicing at Titus' news, 2:12–17. *b.* The vindication at their hands of himself and his fellow-workers not that of an unworthy ministry, as charged by legalists, though a ministry unintelligible to the carnal minded, and given to weak instruments. These, however, will

be glorified in the last day: a hope which strengthens them in their service and supports them in their embassy, cc. 3, 4:1–6, 7–15; 4:16–5:10, 11–19, 5:20–6:10. *c.* Appeal to the Corinthians to dismiss the last vestige of distrust, because Titus' report shows them to have fully repented, 6:11–13; 7:2–16 [6:14–7:1, an unconnected fragment].

iv. **Directions as to the Collection and Paul's Visit,** cc. 8, 9.

a. The generosity of Macedonia an example, 8:1–15. *b.* Commendation of the delegates who take the letter, 16–24. *c.* Exhortation to a generous contribution, c. 9.

v. **Strenuous Denunciation of the Church** for disloyally supporting the open enemies and slanderers of Paul, cc. 10–13.

a. Sarcastic comparison by Paul of himself with his detractors, c. 10. *b.* Denunciation of the intruders, 11:1–15. *c.* Forced self-commendation, 11:16–12:13. *d.* Warning to the church against compelling him to prove his Apostolic authority in punishment, 12:14–13:10.

vi. **Farewell and Blessing,** 13:11–14.

Factiousness rebuked in 1 Cor.

Taking up now Paul's *second* letter, *our* 1 Corinthians, it is manifest that the fundamental difficulty at Corinth was a spirit of conceited self-sufficiency (4:6–13) in their religious charisms (1:5–7; cc. 12–14) and enlightenment (1:18–2:5; 3:18 f.), which had led to factious contentions about the forms of doctrine (1:10–12) coupled with a corresponding and fatal indifference to practical morality (cc. 5, 6). It is true, as urged by B. Weiss,[1] that Paul does not state that there were just four distinct parties in the church; and critics have doubtless gone too far in the attempt

[1] *Einl.* [8] 1898 and art. in *Am. Journ. of Theol.*, April, 1897.

to identify in the four rallying cries of 1:12 four distinct doctrinal divisions. It is noteworthy that Paul has no longer any occasion, as in Galatians, to defend the principle of justification by faith and freedom from the Law, or to warn against the Judaising propaganda. In fact, the only doctrinal discussion of the whole correspondence is the refutation of certain deniers of the (bodily) resurrection, whose tendencies were of course Hellenistic rather than Judaising (cf. Acts 17:32). But it should also be recognised that the rallying cries, "I am (a convert) of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ" (1:12) are not taken at random; and while indicative of tendencies rather than parties, are worthy of the most painstaking scrutiny as exhibiting, in inchoate form, just those currents which the critical historian has come to recognise independently as determinative of the growth of doctrine.[1]

The partisans of Paul and Apollos.

In rebuking the spirit of partisanship, Paul purposely confines himself to two of its manifestations (3:4–6; 4:6), though he implies (3:22 f.) that the same might be said as to all. The proof that the partisans of himself and Apollos are pursuing a mistaken loyalty lies in the fact that he and Apollos agree (3:8), while they are divided. The direction taken by the over-zeal of Paul's own adherents will appear from the letter of the church, since the appeal to him must chiefly represent his own adherents.[2] That taken by the converts of Apollos is easily recognisable from Paul's representation, in 1:17–3:20, of the contrast it presented to his own teaching. He, the founder of the church (4:15), had purposely refrained from

[1] See above p. 14.

[2] See the excerpt from the church's letter in 8:1–8 as below explained. Another extract is 11:2, "ye remember," etc., expressing the strong loyalty of the writers to Paul.

speculative dogma, declaring the simple facts of the crucified and risen Messiah, in whom is forgiveness and salvation (2:1 f.; 15:1–8). The teaching of the Alexandrian had been of such a character as we should expect from the description of Acts 18:24–28. To him, as perhaps to Paul at Athens, the philosophic soil of Achaia had seemed just the place to prove how, in the new religion, the great, half-realised idea of Philo, the Jewish neo-Platonist of Alexandria, could be achieved, and the wisdom of Israel married to the philosophy of Greece. Christ, as the "Wisdom of God," became the key which, by the allegorical method, would unlock all the treasures of divine revelation in the Old Testament. The best fruits of this type of early Christian thinking are visible in Acts 7, Hebrews, the Johannine Epistles and Gospel, and the Alexandrian Fathers; a cruder form in the Epistle of Barnabas.

Scandals in the church.

But the church was not only "puffed up" with its "knowledge," it was grossly lax in its discipline. A case of incest went unrebuked in spite of Paul's previous letter, which they had interpreted in an impracticable sense (c. 5). Litigation between fellow-Christians put to shame the churchly prerogative of arbitration.[1] The Pauline principle that "all things are lawful" (6:12; cf. 10:23), "he that loveth his neighbour hath fulfilled the law" (Rom. 13:8–10), was perverted into antinomian laxity on the subject of meats and fornication. To Greeks it was not clear how any restriction on these points could be involved (6:12–20). The resulting scandal to Jewish believers may be imagined from Acts 15:20–29.

Hence, when Paul now takes up the church's letter

[1] (6:1–11). A practice common to Greek religious fraternities and to the synagogue, Schürer, *Jewish People*, etc., (Engl.) II, ii, § 31, p. 262 f; cf. Lk. 12:13.

Questions referred to Paul: 1. Meats and relations of the sexes.

of inquiry, we are not surprised to find the two questions of marital and domestic relations[1] (c. 7) and "the eating of things sacrificed to idols" (8:1–11:1) occupying the foremost place. For the former his principle is: Existing social relations are to be accepted as the providential conditions within which the divine order must develop. In the latter he pleads for the "weak" brother, whose model appears to be "Cephas." In 8:1*aβ*, 4, 5*a*, 6, 8, we have an extract from the letter before him,[2] exhibiting the "strong" Paulinism of the writers, which Paul qualifies in his comments (8:1*b*, 2 f., 5*b*, 7, 9 ff.) by the principle of consideration. A "defence" against certain deniers of his Apostolic authority, already alluded to in passing, in 4:3, 18–21, is interposed[3] (9:1–18; cf. 2 Cor. 11:7–13; 12:13) before the commendation of his own practice, correctly apprehended, as the right example in the matter of meats (9:19–11:1). With the positive prohibition of participation in idol feasts, and the condemnation of any known eating of εἰδωλόθυτα, as a stumbling of the "weak," coupled with his previous denunciation of fornication (6:12–20; cf. 10:7, 8), Paul has gone as far to meet "the brethren of the Lord and Cephas" as it is possible on his principles to go. The two remaining conditions of eating with the Gentiles imposed at Jerusalem are dropped, as we saw, in Rev. 2:14, 20.

Another extract from the letter in 11:2 introduces

[1] See below, p. 95, note 2.

[2] Heinrici in Meyer's *Commentary*, 1880; cf. W. Locke in *Expositor*, 1897.

[3] Doubtless because his correspondents had referred to "others" (9:2) who repudiated the authority of Paul to which they themselves had appealed in justification of their "liberty" (vs. 1). Paul refers them to his own voluntary sacrifice of his liberty (vs. 19).

Paul's settlement of questions of order in public worship and the Lord's Supper (11:3–34), which leads to a regulation of the coveted "spiritual gifts" of "prophecy," "tongues," etc., in accordance with their real inferiority to the abiding inner spiritual qualities of faith, hope, and love, on the principle that edification is the real end in view (cc. 12–14). 2. Order in public worship.

The attempted Platonising of Paul's doctrine of resurrection is met by a vigorous exposition of his doctrine of the spiritual *body*, based upon the admitted appearance of the risen Christ (c. 15). Epistolary matters occupy the closing chapter. 3. The doctrine of resurrection.

2 Corinthians introduces us to a later stage of affairs. Its problems are chiefly as to what has occurred in the meantime.[1] It is written from Macedonia (7:5; 8:1; 9:2, 4) and sent by Titus and other delegates of the churches appointed to travel with Paul to Jerusalem in charge of the fund (8:18–24). Paul's own coming will immediately follow, according to the plan of 1 Cor. 16:5 f. Thus, it appears that the time is shortly before winter (1 Cor. 16:6; Acts 20:3, 6), and this agrees with 9:2 ("since last year," cf. 1 Cor. 16:1).[2] Some six months, therefore, have elapsed. In the meantime not only had 1 Corinthians been delivered, and Timothy fulfilled his mission and Date and occasion of 2 Cor.

[1] For a complete summary of views see Holtzmann's *Einl.*[3], p. 228 f. Paul's own recent movements, including escape from Ephesus "under sentence of death," so recently that the Corinthians will not have heard of it, are related in 2 Cor. 1:8–10; 2:12 f.; 7:5–7; cf. Acts 19:21–20:1. To say the least, 2 Cor. 2:1; 12:14, 20 f.; 13:1 f. (marginal rendering R. V.) affords no evidence of a visit to Corinth by Paul since the founding of the church: see Hilgenfeld in *Zts. f. w. Th.*, January, 1899. For the movements of Timothy and Titus see *s. v.* "Corinthians" in Hastings' *B. D.*

[2] The Macedonian and Jewish year began about October 1.

returned (1 Cor. 4:17; 16:10 f.; 2 Cor. 1:1), but Paul had sent Titus and a "brother"[1] on business connected with the collection. Until just before, indeed, he has been in an agony of anxiety for his return (7:5–16), for matters in Corinth had taken a far different turn from what Paul had hoped (1 Cor. 4:18–21), and the deniers of his apostolic authority, whom, but for 1 Cor. 4:3–5, 18–21; 9:1–18; 16:22, he had deemed it wisest to treat with silent contempt, had proved their ability so to take advantage of the situation as temporarily to threaten, if not usurp, his control (11:20; 12:11–13). In 10:7; 11:4, 13, 22 f. it appears that these intriguers are no other than the self-styled "(converts) of Christ" of 1 Cor. 1:12.[2]

Paul's antagonists.

They had come armed with "letters of commendation" as "apostles of Christ," preaching "another Jesus," a "different spirit," and a "different gospel," based on knowledge of Christ after the flesh (5:12, 16;

[1] The mission of Titus with "the brother" (12:18) is of course to be distinguished from that on similar business, but accompanied by "the brethren" (8:6, 16, 18, 22–24). It is doubtless the earlier mission referred to in 8:6. On the hypothesis adopted below as to 2 Cor. cc. 10–13, this verse, 12:18, must have been written while Titus was still detained.

[2] Godet (*Introd.* i. p. 254 f.) has an interesting theory based on 2 Cor. 11:3, 4 in comparison with 1 Cor. 12:3. The Christ party were docetists, who used the cry "We are of Christ" not merely in opposition to the names of Paul, Apollos, and Cephas, but to that even of Jesus. "Jesus be anathema" was the cry by which they expressed their contempt for knowledge of Christ "after the flesh." But this is just the opposite disposition from that which Paul attributes to his chief opponents, whom he charges with externality, carnality, dependence on Hebrew descent, etc. The cry "Jesus be anathema" is doubtless correctly interpreted, (cf. 1 Jn. 4:1–3), but those who uttered it stood just at the opposite extreme, out-Pauling Paul in their disdain for external reality, as *e.g.* in the rejection of the doctrine of *bodily* resurrection.

11:18; cf. Gal. 1:6–9) as against what they termed the "veiled gospel" of Paul (4:3). Paul was termed a crazy visionary (5:13), imposing upon his dupes by terrifying letters (10:9 f.), whose threats he spared himself the vain attempt to carry out (10:10) by indefinite postponements and changes of plan (1 Cor. 4: 18–21; 16:4–9; 2 Cor. 1:15–2:3). Nay, they suspected worse. It was clear that if he were "examined" (1 Cor. 4:3; 9:3; 2 Cor. 13:3) it would appear that his refusal to burden them with his support was really because, unlike themselves (2 Cor. 11:20), he lacked authorisation (1 Cor. 9:1–18; 2 Cor. 11:7–12); and how suspicious that, nevertheless, once under his influence all his churches were induced to collect great sums of money and entrust them to him[1] (12:16–18). The least the church should do would be to require a proof of his pretended Apostolic powers, miraculous and otherwise (12:11–13; 13:3, 10), and his ability to discipline, before entrusting money to his agents.

The denunciatory letter.

That Paul should write such a denunciation as 2 Cor. cc. 10–13 against a church which had allowed itself to be swerved from loyalty by the intrigues of such despicable interlopers is not surprising. Their success would be more surprising, but for the devilish plausibility of their imputations, and the circumstances which made it so easy for the church to put off Timothy and Titus[2] with proposals to wait for

[1] Accusations of conversion of similar trust funds contributed for the support of the temple by the Jews of the Dispersion and entrusted to men held in the highest honour are a feature of the time. Special imperial legislation condemned the fraud as "temple robbery"; cf. Acts 19:37; Rom. 2:22.

[2] We conjecture that 2 Cor. 10:1–13:10 was written from Ephesus (10:16) while Titus was at Corinth, on report from him of the disloyal attitude of the church. See below.

Paul's promised coming. What is incomprehensible is, that this denunciation, which is not of the recalcitrants directly, but of *the church as a whole* for yielding to them, should come *at the close of* a letter "overflowing with joy" (7:4) and thankfulness at the coming of Titus with news that the crisis is past, complete obedience reëstablished, the chief offender punished, and a liberal contribution promised (2 Cor. 1:3 f., 11, 14; 2:5–11; 4:15; 6:11–13; 7:2–4, 13–16), so that Paul can thankfully call upon them to prove his boasting of their generosity well founded (cc. 8–9). Even stranger is the forced self-commendation (12:11) *after* disclaimers in 3:1 and 5:12 of "further" self-commendation, because the Corinthians now fulfil their part (3:2 f.). Moreover, the references in 2:4; 7:8–12 imply a letter very different from 1 Corinthians. It had been much more recent; for, though tormented by anxiety as to its effect, Paul has but just been able to obtain the cheering news (2:12 f.; 7:5–7; cf. 10:6).

To be identified with 2 Cor. cc. 10–13.

It was so painful in character that he had even regretted its despatch; yet in what purports to be part of the same letter he uses language so bitter, sarcasm so cutting, that nothing in 1 Corinthians can compare with it. Nothing can fully meet these facts but the recognition that 2 Cor. 10:1–13:10, with its sudden, unexplained change of speaker,[1] and more extraordinary change of tone, must come *before*, and not after, chapters 1–9 — is, in short, a fragment of the painful letter of self-commendation which Paul had been compelled to write by the church's disloyalty.[2]

[1] "Now I Paul myself," implying that others' words have preceded.

[2] So Hausrath, *Der Vierkapitelbrief*, 1870. Others make 2 Cor. 2:4; 7:8, 9, 12 refer to a lost letter, which referred to the case of 1 Cor. 5:1 f.; or assume that a new offence had been committed directly against Paul, who would then be the

With the illustration of Rom. 16:1 ff., 25–27 before us, there is no difficulty in appreciating how two letters written at no great interval to the same church, by the same author, should, when subsequently published, be copied as one whole. This granted, we shall find it the easier to account for the strange fragment 6:14–7:1, which interrupts the connection of 6:11–13 with 7:2–4, without any affinity of subject. It may be hazardous to identify it with the lost letter referred to in 1 Cor. 5:9–13,[1] but one may at least say that such a requirement as 2 Cor. 6:17–7:1 is singularly capable of just the misinterpretation Paul here complains of.[2]

2 Cor. 6:14–7:1 another fragment.

Paul's side of the Corinthian correspondence consisted, then, of *four* letters: (1) 2 Cor. 6:14–7:1 *plus*, calling for separation from heathen pollutions, referred to in 1 Cor. 5:9 and answered by the Corinthians with a request for further explanation as to conjugal relations with heathen and εἰδωλόθυτα. (2) Our 1 Corinthians. (3) The painful letter of forced self-commendation, 2 Cor. 10:1–13:10 *plus*. (4) Our 2 Corinthians, less the exceptions noted.

The storm and stress of the first period are over in the great letter by which the Apostle to the Gentiles prepares for a new basis of mission work in the centre of the world-empire. It is early in 55 A.D., toward

The Epistle to the Romans.

ἀδικηθείς of 2 Cor. 2:5–8, 10. In general support of our view see especially McGiffert, *Apost. Age*, p. 316–320, and Kennedy in *Expositor* for September and October, 1897; in opposition, Zahn, *Einl.* i, § 20.

[1] So Hilgenfeld, Franke, and Whitelaw (*Classical Review*, 1890, p. 12, 317 f.).

[2] Cf. also 6:14 with the first item in the letter of inquiry apparently sent in reply (1 Cor. 7:1–17), and vs. 16 with 1 Cor. 3:16 f.

the end of the three months' stay in Achaia (Acts 20:3; 1 Cor. 16:6 f.), which the timely repentance of the Corinthian church (2 Cor. 10:6; 2:6–9) had at last enabled Paul to make "to their building up and not to their casting down" (2 Cor. 1:23–2:1; 13:2, 10). The great peace offering is ready (Rom. 15:26–29). The Græco-Syrian world is evangelised "from Jerusalem round about unto Illyricum." When Paul has "sealed this fruit" of his Greek churches in Jerusalem, he must seek the larger field of the great Latin West, whither his daring hopes have soared "these many years" (vss. 19–24, 28; cf. Acts 19:21; 2 Cor. 10:16). But Rome is no virgin field. Antioch and even Ephesus, in some degree, were preoccupied territory on Paul's first coming. At Rome, also, according to its own most trustworthy traditions[1] the seed had been self-sown; and with Paul it was a point of honour, if not a stipulation involved in the Jerusalem agreement (Gal. 2:9), "not to glory in another's province in things ready to hand," or "build on another's foundation" (2 Cor. 10:13–16; Rom. 15:20 f.). Sad experience had taught him, indeed, how indispensable it would be to forestall misrepresentation (Rom. 3:8); and while it might be safely assumed that Gentile influences would be at least as strong in Rome as at Antioch (Acts 11:20, 26), it

[1] Ambrosiaster: "In the times of the Apostles Jews were living at Rome in pursuit of their business; such of them, therefore, as were believers impressed on the Romans the confession of Christ with retention of the Law . . . whose faith is commendable, since without seeing any miracles, nor any of the Apostles, they accepted the doctrine of Christ, albeit in Jewish form." Not improbably the decree of Claudius — reported by Suetonius to have "expelled the Jews from Rome for their incessant rioting provoked by one Chrestus" (cf. Acts 18:2) — was really due to agitations in the Synagogue over the new Messianism.

was at least equally certain that the omnipresent Judaiser would be there at his old occupation (Phil. 1:17); while for the friendly disposed, "weak" or "strong" (Rom. 14:1; 15:1), it was in the highest degree desirable to present in advance of his coming a general outline of his doctrine, not as if he would instruct incompetents, but by way of mutual understanding and reciprocal helpfulness (1:11 f.; 15:14 f.).

The Epistle may be logically arranged as follows: — Logical analysis.

i. **Salutation and Epistolary Thanksgiving and Prayer,** 1:1–7, 8–17.

ii. **Doctrinal Section.** The gospel Paul would preach as the power of God unto salvation, 1:18–11:36.

1. *God's Conquest of Evil by Good in the Universe.*

(1) Justification.

a. Gentile and Jew had failed of righteousness and were under the wrath of God, 1:18–3:20.

b. The propitiatory death of Christ furnished a divine means of universal pardon, 3:21–31.

c. Relation of the new dispensation to the Mosaic; a fulfilment of the Abrahamic promise, c. 4.

d. Result of justification by faith; a new humanity starting from Christ, as the old from Adam; the dispensation of law incidental, 5:1–11, 12–21.

(2) Sanctification. The superlegal morality of spiritual living.

a. Freedom from the Law is attained only by death to sin; the experience of a justified soul, cc. 6, 7.

b. Results of the triumph of the Spirit in human life glorified and made eternal. The creation attains its goal with the achievement by the elect of the divine ideal, c. 8.

2. *God's Working in Human History. The Choosing of Israel a Means to Redemption of all,* cc. 9–11.

a. The Messianic Inheritance was given to Israel, though not in the sense of physical descent, and with constant turning to the Gentiles, so that the paradoxical condition — Israel obdurate, the Gentiles accepting — is in accord with Scripture, and also with the superiority of God to race distinctions, cc. 9, 10.

b. But the paradox will soon disappear. Ultimately, the very incoming of the Gentiles will be, as in prophetic times, a provocation to Israel to acknowledge their Messiah. Doxology, c. 11.

iii. **Practical Section.** Ethical application of the doctrine.

a. The rational sacrificial worship of reciprocal love and service, c. 12.

b. The Christian's relation to the social order; good citizenship, c. 13.

c. His relations to the ecclesiastical organism; the duty of Christlike accommodation to the overscrupulous will solve the points of disputed obligation, 14:1–15:13.

iv. **Epilogue.** Personal explanations, plans, and greetings. Farewell, 15:14–33.

Appendix. A Letter of Commendation introducing the Deaconess Phœbe, and various fragments, 16:1–16, 17–23, 25–27.

Occasion, character, and content.

Paul's introductory statement (1:1–17) of the occasion and purpose of his letter explains its character and content. Romans is of the first importance as an exposition of Paulinism, much less important than Galatians or 1 and 2 Corinthians as a source of contemporary history. In unperturbed and orderly completeness, yet here and there with impassioned ardour, the Apostle presents his "gospel" of the "revelation of a righteousness of God by faith unto faith" (1:17), and of a people of promise, who are

the heirs of eternal life. Chapters 1–11 form the theoretical part; chapters 12–15 are practical. Again, chapters 1–8 explain Paul's religion as against Judaism; chapters 9–11, his view of God's providential purpose as related to Israel's national prerogative.

Paul's Gospel.

It is postulated that the wrath of God overhangs the guilty world, the culpable ignorance of the heathen being only less inexcusable than the sin against light of the Jew; though his light is still to be reckoned an advantage, since it gives him at least the knowledge of sin (1:18–3:20). To meet this condition of universal conviction the salvation foreshadowed in the Law and the Prophets has come through the pure grace and love of God. The Messiah, Son and agent of God, came and strove unto death against sin. Only in view of this could free forgiveness be given to sinners even "without works of the Law," and hence above all distinctions of Jew and Gentile, if once for all they unite themselves with their Messiah in his struggle unto death. Without it there would be real or apparent laxity on God's part (3:21–31). Messiah's death is thus seen to be "propitiatory," "for our sins, according to the Scriptures." (1 Cor. 15:3; Is. 53:1–11; cf. Acts 8:32–35). The act by which the convicted and repentant sinner avails himself of the mercy of God, proclaimed in and by the Messiah, is *faith*, the same quality which in Abraham was made the basis of promise, the ground of justification, *before* the Law was given (4:1–5:11). The universal forgiveness thus made possible to all who "die with Christ unto sin" becomes an actual redemption of the spiritual "seed of Abraham" to eternal life, by God's further act of Messianic grace in the impartation of his Spirit, restoring the supremacy of spirit over flesh, a supremacy lost through the inheritance of sin

and death devolved upon all sons of Adam. The sense of this loss it was the real function of the Law to produce (5:11–7:25). As incarnate vehicle of the life-restoring Spirit, in which he himself triumphed over death, Christ is to humanity a second Adam, agent of a spiritual new creation, wherein even nature participates, being ultimately restored to that subordination to the "sons of God" originally intended by the Creator (8:19–23; cf. Gen. 1:26 f. and Heb. 2:5–9). This sublime precreative purpose of God, to make himself a holy people endowed with eternal life, "conformed to the image of his Son," is the key to revelation, including that in Christ, and is the unshakable ground of our triumphant hope (c. 8).

Relation of Jew and Gentile.

Subordinate to this eternal purpose of election is the providential relation in history of Jew and Gentile, the former first blessed for the fathers' sake, then rejected, save a remnant, because of their own perversity; the latter now welcomed to Israel's inheritance, though ultimately, as Paul hopes and believes, the now hostile mass of Israel will be impelled by very jealousy to return to its Messiah (cc. 9–11). Such is Paul's exposition of "the general tenor of the Scriptures."

The practical duties which flow from this insight into the divine plan are such as characterise the Spirit given by Christ. It implies the law of love and mutual service (c. 12). It implies obedience to the present political order, and to social morality (c. 13). It implies consideration of the "strong" for the "weak" in the disputed matters belonging to the present relation of Jew and Gentile in the Church (14:1–15:13).

The letter ends with the epistolary matters of 15:14–33 whose touching relation of the circumstances and farewell we have already reviewed.

Conditions at Rome.

The vexed question as to conditions presupposed in the Roman church[1] is probably unanswerable for the reason that Paul himself clearly has before his consciousness not local and specific, but general conditions. That both Pauline and Petrine elements were present is both *a priori* probable and clearly implied in chapters 14, 15. But Paul himself varies. If he is concerned to show that Rome is really in his province, then there is no question of the Gentile character of the community (1:5, 6, 13–15). In 11:13–32 the arguments are directed explicitly and exclusively to Gentiles. If he thinks of the elements whose religious training (7:1) and experience (7:4–6), antipathies (3:5–8; 11:1, 11) and sympathies (3:1–4, 9; 9:1–5; 10:1, 2), whose habitual attitude toward his gospel (6:1, 15; 7:7) he so well knows, he addresses his readers as Jews (2:1, 17–27), recognises their Jewish prejudices, tactfully meets their moral and religious objections, and removes their misunderstandings and suspicions.[2]

Rom. 16 a separate letter of commendation.

If the argument of Lightfoot,[3] from the type of names found in Roman inscriptions, could really convince us that chapter 16, the letter of commendation of the deaconess Phœbe, was originally addressed to Rome, and not Ephesus, as internal characteristics rather indicate, this chapter would present an exception to the rule of absence of local and specific knowledge in Romans. But how can it really belong with the letter to Rome? Had Paul's entire company of

[1] A Jewish majority — Gentile majority — Proselyte Jewish Christian minority according to various authorities. See Holtzmann's *Introd.*, and Vincent, *Student's New Testament Handbook*, p. 74.

[2] Holtzmann, *Einl.*[3], p. 234 f.

[3] *Commentary on Philippians*, p. 169 ; enlarged on by Sanday and Headlam, *Comm.*, p. 422.

helpers suddenly emigrated thither, Prisca and Aquila at their head?[1] Yet in 2 Tim. 4:19 Prisca and Aquila are back again in Ephesus, and Epænetus, who comes next, is "the first fruits of *Asia*" (cf. 1 Cor. 16:15). Paul has affectionate, personal greetings for a host of friends, including "kinsmen," "fellow-prisoners," "fellow-workers," "apostles in Christ before him," even one whose mother has been a mother to him (vs. 13); he knows the households where they gather, and their individual work (vs. 12) and relationships. The churches of Achaia also join in the salutation as they cordially commend their sister from Cenchreæ, the port of Corinth. But even the Corinthian friends who stand about Paul appear equally well acquainted; Timothy first of all, then three unknown Jewish brethren, then Tertius, who is serving as amanuensis, throw in a greeting, followed by Gaius (1 Cor. 1:14) and Erastus (2 Tim. 4:20). Such close relations at this time with Rome would be unaccountable. Yet everything points to the time and place when the great epistle, which ends at 15:33, was written; so that the "epistle of commendation" (cf. 2 Cor. 3:1), though a separate letter, may well have been dictated to the same amanuensis at the same sitting.[2] But we have evidence, both internal and

[1] The reply of Sanday and Headlam, Milligan (*s. v.* Epænetus, Hastings' *B. D.*), and others to Renan's argument, that it "rests on three names only out of twenty-six," assumes that he appeals to none save such as can be connected with Ephesus. But it appears that besides Prisca, Aquila, and Epænetus, Paul must have been intimately associated with at least Andronicus, Junias, Ampliatus, Urbanus, Stachys, Rufus, and his mother, all of whom, consequently, must have gone to Rome from some unspecified place in Paul's field of labour. *Ten* names indicate a different place from Rome, *three* of them define it as Ephesus.

[2] If the names should be deemed conclusive evidence of a Roman destination, Rom. 16 might better be taken as a product

external, that not all which in our texts follows after chapter 15 was originally addressed to Rome. It may be that our thanks are due to some unknown Corinthian copyist, whose zeal led him, after completing his real task, to append what more he found before him in the same hand, though of a different and more familiar character, including fragments of a separate letter. That which remains shows it to have been addressed to a church endeared to Paul by years of arduous, but richly fruitful labour, amid a host of helpers; a church probably of Asia (vs. 5), where he had been imprisoned (vs. 7), where were Prisca and Aquila, who had laid down their necks for his life (vs. 4; cf. 1 Cor. 16:19; 2 Cor. 1:8–11), where there were also, however, "division and occasions of stumbling," pretended servants of Christ who "served their own belly," and violent opposition of Satan (vss. 17–20; cf. 1 Cor. 16:9; 2 Tim. 2:15 ff.; Acts 20:29; Rev. 2:2, 6, etc.), pretence of wisdom, without moral earnestness (vs. 19; cf. Pastoral Epistles and 1 John *passim*) against which the church must be fortified by an understanding of the great mystery revealed in Christ of the eternal purpose of God in creation and redemption (vss. 25–27; see on Eph.). This church can scarcely be other than Ephesus.

Addressed to Ephesus.

The wide acknowledgment won in modern times by Schulz's theory of Rom. 16 as such a fragment,[1] is largely due to the support of textual evidence. Even Hort[2] cannot believe that the doxology, 16:25–27,

of the unknown period assumed as that of the Pastoral Epistles, when Paul might have such knowledge of conditions in Rome; cf. vs. 18 with Phil. 3:18 f. and vss. 25–27 with Tit. 1:1–3, and note vs. 7.

[1] Schulz (1829) was followed by many, including more recently Lipsius, Weizsäcker, and McGiffert.

[2] See for the textual discussion the essays of Lightfoot and

which in some manuscripts is wanting, in others variously placed, genuine as it is, could ever have belonged in the letter to Rome. The R. V. rightly omits verse 24. On the other hand, the second century text which ended the epistle with 14:23, or with the doxology, 16:25–27, appended at that point,[1] certainly cut off too much,[2] whether from doctrinal prejudice (Marcion) or possibly through variant tradition. The question is too abstruse for details,[3] but textual evidence alone will prove that early editors of Romans were embarrassed by a surplus of material in these closing chapters.[4] Perhaps the disordered fragments,[5] 16:1–16, 17–20, 21–23, 25–27, of a simultaneous lost letter to Ephesus, appended by the copyist at Corinth, were recognised as unconnected with the main epistle when this form came to be compared with that preserved at Rome. The influence of this fact, combined with Marcion's arbitrary mutilation[6] of chapter 15,

The doxology another fragment.

Hort, *Journ. of Philol.* ii, iii, reprinted in Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, pp. 287–374.

[1] So Marcion, as reported by Origen and Tertullian, also cod. Amiatinus and cod. Fuld.

[2] 14:23 is an impossible ending, and the appending of 16:25–27 is no real improvement. 15:3–6 looks like a duplicate of 7–13, as if a discarded page had been accidentally included; but 15:1 f., 7–13 is indispensable to c. 14, as 15:14–33 is indispensable to 1:10–15, and to the epistle as a whole.

[3] Fuller discussion in my art. in *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.* for 1899.

[4] Rom. stood last in the early canon of Paul's letters to the Seven Churches (*Murat. Can.*, p. 50). This position may help to explain the fragments added in c. 16.

[5] Verses 17–20 cannot belong to Rom., which neither displays knowledge of local conditions, nor assumes authority; nor to c. 16 as it stands. Verses 25–27 form an anacoluthon. No place at all can be found for them. There is affinity with Rom., but more with Eph. (cf. Rom. 8:18–39; Eph. 3:5 f., 9:20 f.; Tit. 1:2 f.).

[6] Origen "dissecuit."

might lead to a limited currency of the form lacking chapters 15, 16. The longer form, however, would soon triumph, not merely because of the invariable tendency of longer texts to supersede briefer rivals, but because of the heretical taint which, in this case, could not fail to cling to the shorter.[1]

[1] On Rom. see especially Sanday and Headlam, *Internat. Commentary Series*, pp. xiii–cix; also Godet's *Commentary* (Engl. [2] 1892) and J. Morison's three monographs on Rom. 3, Rom. 9, and Rom. 6. On 1 and 2 Cor. see Meyer's *Commentary*, [5] 1869 (Engl. 1884), and Godet's (Engl. 1886). It is needless to repeat references to the special articles in standard *Bible Dictionaries* and *Encyclopædias* such as the Hastings *Dictionary of the Bible* and Cheyne's *Encyclopædia Biblica* and to special treatises in well-known commentaries covering the entire N. T., such as the *Pulpit Commentary* or *The Expositor's*. See above, p. 79.

CHAPTER V

THE EPISTLES OF THE CAPTIVITY

The Cæsarean captivity a period of silence.

THE long and, to Paul (Rom. 15:25–33), momentous period on which so full a light is shed by the record of a companion (Acts 20–28), affords us not a word from his pen.[1] Whether Paul's hopeful confidence (Rom. 15:29) in a removal of misunderstandings and reunion of the church by this visit was justified, we must judge by the tone of his subsequent letters.

Here it is not merely the disappearance of the hitherto constant need of mediating between the "strong" and the "weak" on the matter of "the pollutions of idols," and of all traces of further real danger from the Judaisers,[2] which convinces us that Paul was not disappointed; but more especially the note of triumphant joy in the unity of the Church characteristic of the letters which immediately follow, and which in Ephesians is dominant, rising repeatedly into prolonged rhapsodies (1:3–14, 18–23; 2:13–22; 3:5–11; 4:4–16; 5:25–30; cf. Col. 1:18–25).

The common occasion to which we owe the three connected letters, Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon,

[1] As to the view which places the writing of Eph., Col., Philem. in Cæsarea, see above, p. 55.

[2] Phil. 1:18 shows their malignity in Rome to be harmless; 3:2 ff. is a recapitulation of former warnings. In 18 f. it appears that he is speaking not because of conditions in Philippi, but because of past experience; cf. 3:19 with Rom. 16:18.

is best seen in Philemon, the engaging note of Paul to a personal friend and fellow-worker, bespeaking a kindly reception for the bearer, Onesimus, Philemon's runaway slave, whom Paul would gladly have retained in his own service; for in the comparative freedom of his Roman imprisonment (Acts 28:30 f.; cf. 24:23) he had both won him to the faith, and begun to love him as his "very heart," his "child begotten in his bonds." With a gentle playfulness (vs. 11) he pleads with Philemon to treat Onesimus "no longer as a slave, but a beloved brother in the Lord." Paul engages personally to repay any loss incurred through Onesimus, but hints that his own scrupulousness in returning the runaway should meet the Christian return of renunciation of ownership by Philemon; though Paul will not enjoin it, knowing that Philemon will do even beyond the letter of the request (v. 21).

Occasion of Philemon and companion epistles.

The household includes an Apphia, Philemon's wife, and Archippus, his son, besides a "church" among the retinue of clients, freedmen, and slaves. In Col. 4:9, 17; Philem. 2, it appears that Archippus is minister of this church, which is one of the two or more (Col. 4:15) in Colossæ founded by Paul's present Colossian fellow-prisoner, Epaphras (Col. 1:7 *v.l.*). Hence, Philemon will have been converted in Ephesus (Philem. 19; Col. 2:1; cf. Acts 19:10).

Paul is in company with Timothy (Philem. 1) and Epaphras, who is greatly exercised for the Colossians and for the adjoining churches of Hierapolis and Laodicea. Aristarchus of Thessalonica (Acts 20:4), another fellow-prisoner, Mark, who also is leaving for Proconsular Asia, and Jesus Justus, three Jews who, in contrast with the rest (cf. Phil. 1:15–18; 2:21), are a help and comfort to Paul, are with him. Demas, as yet still faithful (cf. 2 Tim. 4:10), and Luke, a "beloved physician," two Gentile fellow-workers, also

Circumstances of Paul.

send greetings (Philem. 23 f.; Col. 4:10–14). Tychicus of Asia (Acts 20:4) and Onesimus are the bearers (Col. 4:7–9). Paul is hoping soon to be released and to visit Asia in person (Philem. 22; cf. Phil. 2:24).

The absence of any mention in this group, Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, of the earthquake which, according to Tacitus (*Ann.* 14:27), reduced Laodicea, in 60 A.D., to ruins (Eusebius, however, dating the overthrow of all three cities of Col. 4:13 in 64), confirms our early dating of Paul's imprisonment in Rome (58–60 A.D.), for his arrival cannot have been recent, his correspondents being informed in general as to his circumstances.

Analysis of Philem. Its genuineness.

It is noteworthy that even so brief a letter as Philemon conforms to the regular epistolary forms, as follows:—

i. **Salutation**, 1–3.
ii. **Epistolary Thanksgiving and Prayer**, 4–7.
iii. **Principal Subject** (commendation of Onesimus), 8–22.
iv. **Greetings and Benediction**, 23–25.

Baur himself half apologises for the really monstrous suggestion that it is the work of an ecclesiastical forger of the second century, inditing a romance in the interest of his views on the slavery question. Fortunately, to-day not even the necessity of acknowledging the genuineness of the connected elements of Colossians can restrain the most radical Tübingen critics from recognition of its inimitable genuineness. The connection of Colossians with Ephesians is so intimate that we must discuss their occasion and content together.

The emphatic position of the contrasted pronouns in

Col. 1:9; Eph. 1:15; 6:21,[1] with some other data indicates that Paul had received a letter from the Colossians, probably including messages from the adjoining churches of the Lycus Valley (2:1; 4:16; cf. Eph. 1:15); for Colossians was accompanied by another letter which would reach Colossæ from Laodicea, and the two were to be exchanged (Col. 4:16). Colossians, accordingly, will have supplemented the generalities of this circular letter. For the latter was designed for churches of which Paul had even less personal knowledge than of Colossæ (Col. 2:1; cf. 1:7 f.), and could not therefore be made adequately specific in application to special conditions at Colossæ, of which Paul knew through Epaphras (Col. 4:12 f.). Now it is a strong support for the identification of Ephesians with this circular, which was to reach Colossæ "from Laodicea," that its outline, thought, and even much of its phraseology are identical with Colossians except for the paragraphs Col. 2:1–3:4 and 4:9–18, which are respectively a reply to *local* heretics and Paul's greeting to *local* friends. In Ephesians the thought appears in expanded form.

Eph. and Col. are replies to letters.

This common plan is as follows: —

Analysis of the two epistles.

i. **Salutation**, Eph. 1:1 f. = Col. 1:1 f.

ii. **Epistolary Thanksgiving and Prayer**, Eph. 1:3–3:21 = Col. 1:3–29.

a. Thanksgiving for God's precreative choice of his

[1] Thus Eph. 6:21: Ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ κατ' ἐμέ, τί πράσσω, must be rendered in strictness: "But that ye may be informed of my affairs, ye also of mine (sc. as I have been of yours)." Similarly 1:15 κἀγώ . . . ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, and Col. 1:9 καὶ ἡμεῖς . . . ὑπερ ὑμῶν, "*I* (*we*) too . . . on *your* behalf." The information conveyed is also alluded to in Eph. 1:15; Col. 1:4 (but cf. 8), 6; 2:5–7, 16, 20; 4:10; the expressions of sympathy are met in Eph. 3:13; 6:22; Col. 1:24; 2:2; 4:8. See the art. by H. B. Swete, *Expositor*, December, 1898.

people in the person of their Head, and revelation in him of this solution of the mystery of being, Eph. 1:3–14. (In Col. 1:3–8 for the good report of Epaphras as to the Colossians.)

b. Prayer for their mental enlargement to appreciate the greatness of this divine calling, which historically is revealed in the adoption of a united people of God, Jewish and Gentile, whose separation has been overcome by Christ, Eph. 1:5–23; 2:1–10, 11–22=Col. 1:9–23.

c. (Peculiar to Ephesians, but cf. Col. 1:24–29 with Eph. 3:1–13.) Repetition of the prayer, with special digression for the benefit of such as may not be familiar with Paul's "revelation of the mystery." Doxology, Eph. c. 3.

iii. **Doctrinal Section** (peculiar to Colossians).

Refutation of the theosophic speculations and asceticism of the false teachers at Colossæ by an application of the "Mystery of God," who, before creation, chose Christ to be head of the universe, in whom we died to this world and rose to the heavenly, Col. 2:1–3:4. (Much of the doctrine included in Ephesians under § ii.)

iv. **Practical Application**, Eph. 4:1–6:20=Col. 3:5–4:6.

a. (Peculiar to Ephesians.) Hence, the *charismata* are to be used for edification of Christ's body, Eph. 4:1–16.

b. The fleshly life must be superseded by the Christ-life with its characteristics of purity and love, Eph. 4:17–5:21=Col. 3:5–17.

c. And individual propensity curbed by the mutual subordinations of the divine social organism, Eph. 5:22–6:9=Col. 3:18–4:1.

d. General exhortation to prayer and watchfulness, Eph. 6:10–20=Col. 4:2–6.

v. **Personal Epistolary Matters and Farewell,** Eph. 6:21–24=Col. 4:7–18.

Character and object of Eph.

Paul may almost be said, in Eph. 1:3–3:21 (=Col. 1:3–29), to have "cast his remarks into the form of a prayer," for the false teachers are wholly in the background (5:6), and the reason for the special subject of thanksgiving and prayer is only perceived by comparing Colossians. Paul aims at a deeper grounding of the faith of his correspondents by an adequate apprehension of the cosmic character of the redemption. Christ and the Church, mutually complementary as male and female in the ideal Adam of Gen. 1:27, or as head and body, both together in their ideal supremacy the complement of the Creator, give the key to the problem of the universe. The long hidden mystery of God's design in creation (Eph. 3:9–11; Col. 1:26 f.; cf. Rom. 16:25–27) may be expressed in the one word εὐδοκία (Eph. 1:5, 9; Col. 1:19),[1] the preordaining choice by the Creator of a Being complementary to himself (Eph. 1:9–11; Col. 1:15–19). For in behalf of, unto, and through this Son, the archetypal Man, made in God's image, the entire creation, heavenly and earthly, personal and impersonal, was produced (Gen. 1:27 f.) that ultimately it might be subject unto him (Eph. 1:22; cf. 1 Cor. 15:27 f.; Heb. 2:5–8). But this precreative choice of the Son making him "the first-born of all creation (Col. 1:15–17) involved as his complement a redeemed

[1] For a discussion of the sense of this technical term, as connected with the title ὁ Ἀγαπητός (= ὁ Ἐκλελεγμένος Lk. 9:35) here (Eph. 1:6) and in Matt. 12:18; also with Lk. 2:14 ("the men τῆς εὐδοκίας" *i.e.* God's elect), the Voice from Heaven, Mk. 1:11, also Matt. 17:5; Mk. 9:7; Lk. 9:35; 2 Pet. 1:17, see my art. "On the aorist εὐδόκησα," *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.*, 1897. Cf. also Acts 9:22 (Western text).

people as his bride, the Church (Eph. 5:23–32). Christ, as manifested in the glorified body, must be identified with this archetypal, ideal Man, and is actually subduing all powers both of earth and heaven.

Christ and his people heirs of the universe.

The Church, chosen by God in him before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1:4 f.), is this bride; a new people of God's own possession, joint heirs with Christ of the world (Eph. 1:18–22; Rom. 4:13; 8:17; Gal. 4:7; Heb. 1:2, etc.). This people of God is not Jewish only, but as now seen in the working out of the redemptive process, both Jewish and Gentile (Eph. c. 2; cf. Rom. cc. 9–11; Gal. 3:26–29). The εὐδοκία, therefore, or primeval purposive choice of the Creator, contemplating "the Beloved," and us his redeemed people "in him," is the key to the eternal mystery of creation and redemption; and it has been placed by Jesus in the hands of his Apostles and saints (Eph. 3:5; Col. 1:27). Christ, its head, is the explanation of creation; for the universe, visible and invisible, material and personal, is both "from him and unto him" (Col. 1:15–19; cf. 1 Cor. 8:6). The Church is the explanation of God's redemptive working in history: for it is its intended outcome; the body of Christ, complementary to him as both together are the complement (πλήρωμα) of God (Col. 1:19 f.; cf. 1 Cor. 3:22 f.). This comprehensive outlook over all time, all space, all being, is Paul's revelation of the mystery of the eternal purpose of the Creator which he purposed in Christ Jesus (Eph. 3:9–11); and he rightly judges it to be worthy of most strenuous prayer on behalf of his readers, that their mental and spiritual capacity may be enlarged to take it in (Eph. 1:17–19; 3:14–19; Col. 1:9; 2:1–3).

The Colossian heresy.

After this sublime cosmology, overburdening and bursting through the framework of doxology and prayer with which he had begun, Paul introduces in

Col. c. 2, the special adaptation of his thought to local conditions. Agents of a Judaistic (vs. 16) theosophy had found congenial soil for their proselytising work in Phrygian Asia, ancient home of mysticism and eclectic theosophy. Their commendation of circumcision (cf. vs. 11, "ye also"), the Law (vs. 14), Sabbaths and other holy days (vs. 16), recalls the Judaisers of Galatians. But we have something more here than mere Pharisaic nomism. There was discrimination of meats *and drinks* with an ascetic instead of ceremonial purpose (vss. 21–23). The Old Testament ordinances were supplemented by "precepts and doctrines of men," which Paul calls "will-worship," as he would not call the prescribed worship of the Law. These observances they commended as properly due to the angelic and elemental Powers[1] through whom the Law was given (cf. Gal. 3:19; 4:1–3, 8–11; Acts 7:42 f., 53; Heb. 2:5), and with whom the adept entered into communication (vs. 18), so that the unique lordship of the Son of Man was obscured, if not denied (vss. 8–10, 19). We see, in fact, the beginnings of that amalgamation of Judaism with Gnosticism, which, entering perhaps by the avenue of Essene[2] sects, was already seeking to rival or supplant Christianity in the religious conquest of the world (Tit. 1:10–16).

Eph. reflects similar conditions.

The knowledge that such conditions were present may have affected the more general letter in its treat-

[1] The "Elements of the world" both here and in Gal. 4:3, 8 f. are semi-personal, consistently with the general type of Oriental cosmologies; for a description see Rev. 4:6 f. and cf. Herm. *Vis.* 3:13, 3 and the passages adduced by Everling, *Paulin. Angelol. u. Dämonol.*, 1888.

[2] See Lightfoot's *Colossians*, § ii, *The Colossian Heresy*, and *Dissertations* 1–3 on Essenism. Also Friedländer's *Der vorchristliche Gnosticismus der Juden*, 1898.

ment of the theme (cf. Eph. 4:14; 5:6);[1] but the author only interjects at this point his rhapsody on the organic unity of the Church, whose current of life is the Spirit flowing from the ascended Christ (4:1–16).

The practical section in both epistles (Eph. 4:17–6:20; Col. 3:1–4:6) is specially close in connection. Mutual love and purity belong to the Christian's spirit as against the darkness and lust of heathenism, with joy of the inward man as against enjoyment for the outward (Eph. 4:17–5:21=Col. 3:1–17). The domestic relations are to be held sacred, as a type of the organism of the divine kingdom (Eph. 5:22–6:9= Col. 3:18–4:1), and constant watchfulness and prayer, including prayer for Paul, are enjoined (Eph. 6:10–20=Col. 4:2–6). Tychicus, the bearer, will give them news from Paul (Eph. 6:21 f.=Col. 4:7 f.).

Original address of Eph.

Thus, the difference between the two epistles is obviously one of Paul's relation to the readers. In Ephesians Paul thinks of the universal Church; in Colossians, of the church of Epaphras. The complete absence of any local colour in Ephesians would be enough in itself to discredit the title "to the Ephesians," to say nothing of 1:15, "Having heard of your faith," 3:2; 4:21, 22, "if indeed ye have heard," and other positive indications that Paul is addressing strangers (cf. Acts 20:18 ff., 31). These phenomena are borne out against the early tradition by the textual evidence, which shows conclusively

[1] So the reiterated representation of Christ and his people as superior to all angelic and demonic Powers 1:10, 20–22; 2:1 f., 6; 3:10, 14; 4:9 f.; 6:12. In Col. this is made even more distinct. The highest ranks of angels owe to Christ both their creation and redemption, 1:16 f., 20; 2:8–10, 18 f.; for with Paul the drama of redemption includes angels as well as men, 2:15; cf. Eph. 3:10; 1 Tim. 5:21; Heb. 1:2–14; 2:5–8.

that the copies in circulation during the second and third centuries had not the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in 1:1. Certain "recent manuscripts" referred to by Basil in the latter half of the fourth century are the earliest to which the words can be traced. The ancient reading is interpreted by most of the Fathers and by some modern scholars "the saints who are" (really such), or "who are also faithful." Other modern scholars, beginning with Archbishop Ussher (1650), supposed the Apostle to have left a blank, the letter having been intended for a number of churches, and the bearer being authorised to insert in each locality the proper name. All attempts to translate without a geographical term are excluded by the fact that Paul does not address this letter, nor others, to classes distinguished by moral character, but to localities (6:21; cf. Col. 1:1).[1] The blank theory is too modern, and does not account for the textual history.

To the Laodiceans among others.

The surest clew is in the fact that in Marcion's text — by far the earliest of which we have any knowledge — the epistle was entitled "To the Laodiceans." Tertullian, who informs us of the fact, insinuates that Marcion was giving himself airs as a *diligentissimus explorator;* but it is not likely that Marcion drew the inference from Col. 4:16, which does not speak of an epistle *to*, but an epistle *from* Laodicea. Probably a variant tradition was current in his Phrygian home. Proconsular Asia was certainly the region to which Tychicus bore the letter. Hence, Ephesus would be visited on the way. Col. 4:16 is highly favourable to the idea that Laodicea was one of the churches for which it was intended (cf. Gal. 1:2; 2 Cor. 1:1). In that case, Hierapolis and Colossæ would be included

[1] Against T. K. Abbott, *Internat. Crit. Commentary*, p. 2. The interpretation adopted by him makes οὖσιν superfluous.

in the perhaps unfamilar geographical term now lost, for which ἐν Ἐφέσῳ has been substituted in the later texts. The substitution, first in tradition[1] and ultimately in the text itself, was of course due to the prominent position of Ephesus, from whence copies of the letter would generally be derived.

Early attestation of Eph.

We have seen that Ephesians is surpassed by scarcely another New Testament writing besides 1 Corinthians in explicit attestation from the earliest times; for the allusion in Ignatius *ad Eph.* 12 (συμμύσται), while precarious in itself, becomes a probable allusion to Eph. 1:9; 3:3, 4, 9, etc., when the wide circulation of this epistle from the very beginning is considered.[2] "From this evidence," says Abbott, "it is all but certain that the epistle already existed about 95 A.D. (Clement), quite certain that it existed about 110 A.D."

Genuineness.

All this without taking account of its admitted influence on New Testament writings. For granting that Col. 4:16 may refer to some unknown letter, and not to this which so well suits the case, Holtzmann himself would be the last to deny that 1 Peter, John, and 1 John show familiarity with its doctrine of Christ and the Church.[3] But with the example of Hebrews

[1] Even the Fathers, who are ignorant of any ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the text, regard the letter as written to Ephesus.

[2] For we have indisputable employment in Clement of Rome, c. 36 (cf. Eph. 1:19), c. 38 (Eph. 5:21), c. 46 (cf. Eph. 4:4–6), c. 64 (cf. Eph. 1:4, 5), probable use in Διδ. 4:10, 11 and *Barn.* 19:7 (cf. Eph. 6:9, 5), also in Ign. *ad Eph.*, c. 1 (Eph. 1:1 ff.; 5:1), c. 6 (Eph. 6:11), c. 9 (Eph. 2:20–22), and *ad Polyc.* 5 (Eph. 5:29), unquestionable use in Polyc. *ad Phil.*, c. 1 (Eph. 2:5, 8, 9) and c. 12 (Eph. 4:26), with increasing familiarity in later writers.

[3] We may cite in general the "high Christology" of all the Johannine writings as depending on Eph. and Col., but cf. Eph. 2:21 f. with Jn. 2:19–21; Eph. 4:10 with Jn. 3:13; Eph. 5:

before us, it will not do to say that the age from 75–100 to which Holtzmann assigns it was incapable of producing so splendid a reproduction of Pauline thought. Against so able and careful a scholar one cannot venture to say that some such masterful unknown genius might not have elaborated a pseudo-Pauline letter by a process of minutely imitative modelling on the basis of Colossians, and subsequently have expanded the model itself by loans from his copy, so as to produce the appearance of dependence on both sides. To put his twin letters in circulation without exciting a ripple of suspicion, even when Ephesians was so promptly seized on by the Valentinians in support of Gnostic speculations, may also be deemed a possibility. But to find a motive sufficient to induce a teacher of such fervid genius to condescend to such slavish toil, even if to that age less dishonest than to ours, when without any such false pretence his doctrine would be scarcely less acceptable and incomparably more unfettered, this is a task indeed! It behooves us to scrutinise the grounds which are held to make this needful.

Objections considered. 1. Generalising character.

1. The vague historical situation. But this ceases to be incongruous or incomprehensible as soon as the corrupt reading ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is abandoned and the circular character of the letter recognised. Local colour should be wanting if, as assumed, this be the letter "from Laodicea."

2. "The holy Apostles," etc.

2. The objective way in which the author speaks of himself and "the Apostles" (2:20; 4:11). But in so far as it differs from the Pauline manner (cf. 1 Cor. 3:10; 12:28) it may be accounted for by the lack of

13 f. with Jn. 3 : 19–21, and see *Intern. Comm.* on Eph. and Col., T. K. Abbott, 1897, p. xxviii. The basis of N. T. cosmological Christology can be nothing else but Pauline (cf. Heb. 1 : 1–2 : 15 with 1 Cor. 15 : 24–28, and Rev. 22 : 13 with Col. 1 : 15).

concrete relations. In 3:1–3, 7; 4:1; 6:20 we have indeed the effort to create such a concrete relation, and that by virtue of the claim to a position among the consecrated Twelve (3:5),[1] as a sharer in the great revelation; nay, as having been peculiarly entrusted with an essential part of its content. But with proper rendering this cannot be deemed un-Pauline (cf. 1 Cor. 9:1 ff.; 15:3–11), unless we ignore Paul's reverence for his office and longing for solidarity with the Twelve in the view of Christians to him unknown. Neither is there vanity in 3:4, which if it refers to 2:11–22 is only concerned with a divinely granted insight, not the result of Paul's own powers, nor overwrought modesty in 3:8, considering the intention of the paradox.

3. The high Christology.

3. The exalted Christology might seem incredible at so early a period but for the simple fact that in every essential feature it is corroborated in undeniably genuine passages. Disregarding the parallels in Colossians, as disputed, we find the same conception of Christ as preëxistent in 2 Cor. 8:9; Phil. 2:5–11; as the image of God, archetype of redeemed humanity, in Rom. 8:29; 2 Cor. 3:18; Phil. 3:21; as beginning and end of creation in association with God in 1 Cor. 8:6; 15:22–28; as lord of all created being in heaven and earth and under the earth, triumphant over angelic and demonic Powers in Phil. 2:9–11; 1 Cor. 15:24 ff.; as agent of a cosmic redemption in Rom. 8:19–22. And this is but the negative half of

[1] This verse is the equivalent of vs. 10 and Col. 1:26. "The saints" as a whole are entrusted with the revelation, but more especially those particular "saints who are Apostles and prophets" (ἅγιοι ἀπόστολοι καὶ προφῆται), and hence officially proclaim it. To Paul it had been specially revealed (Gal. 1:15 f.). It would not be true to say that the other Apostles had not also received it, though less unreservedly (see above, p. 64).

the argument; for in 1 Cor. 1:24, 30; 2:6–10, 16 we have hints that Paul also has a philosophy wherewith he could put to shame the speculations of the Corinthians, had he deemed them prepared for it,—a philosophy which was concerned with Christ as the Power (δύναμις) of God and the Wisdom (σοφία) of God. It consisted of a revelation of the "hidden mystery of God which he foreordained before the worlds unto our glory" (1 Cor. 2:7; cf. Rom. 16:25–27; Eph. 1:4–12; 3:9–11), and set forth the divine plan in creation and redemption (1 Cor. 2:9–11). Again, what have we in Romans as a whole but this same theme of the revealed purpose of God in creation and redemption (11:31–36)? Here the full extent of what is meant by the cosmic atonement is but darkly hinted in chapter 8, and the union of Jew and Gentile in the new people of God in chapters 9–11 is only a hope. But in Ephesians, with the supplemental parallels of Colossians, Paul opens wide to us, as no imitator could, the doors of that comprehensive cosmic philosophy of his faith.

4. Apocalyptic ideas and expressions.

4. When Paul expressly undertakes the "revelation of the mystery of Christ, which in other generations was not made known unto the sons of men," nay, was "hid in God who created all things," even from "the Principalities and the Powers in the heavenly places" (cf. Rom. 16:25–27; 1 Cor. 2:6–8; 1 Pet. 1:12), we should need no second hint to seek in the current *apocalyptic* literature, to which Paul was no stranger (2 Thess. 2:39; 2 Cor. 6:14; 12:2), and whose interest was as truly cosmological as eschatological,[1] for the analogies which will explain both his thought and language. In point of fact, we find everywhere in this literature the conception that the world was

[1] R. H. Charles, *s. v.* "Apocalyptic Lit." Hastings' *B. D.*

created for Messiah and his people, and will ultimately be subjected to him. It is based upon Gen. 1:27 f. This purpose of creation, which is therefore its alpha and its omega, beginning and ending, God concealed from human philosophy, and even from angels, who vainly crave to know the secret of their creation and destiny. He revealed it to Enoch, Moses, and other chosen prophets and seers.[1] In Christian apocalyptic Christ is of course the "Mediator of the new covenant" (Heb. 8:6; cf. *Ass. Mos.* 1:1), and the doctrine assumes the form: "For the sake of *the Church* the universe was created."[2] Remembering what literature underlies Paul's cosmology, we shall not be surprised if in Ephesians there are a number of "un-Pauline" expressions, particularly in this special field.[3] We shall rather be unable to explain how an imitator could

[1] Eph. 1:4–11 is a reproduction, in places almost verbal, of the thought of *Assumptio Mosis* 1:14–16 (14–30 A.D., R. H. Charles):—"God hath created the world on behalf of his people. But he was not pleased to manifest this purpose of creation from the foundation of the world, in order that the Gentiles might thereby be convicted, yea to their own humiliation might by their (cosmogonic) arguments convict one another (cf. 1 Cor. 1:27 ff.). Accordingly he designed and devised me [Moses], and prepared me before the foundation of the world that I should be the mediator of his covenant" (cf. Gal. 1:15 f.; 3:19 f.; Heb. 8:6; 9:15; 12:24; Eph. 3:2–9, etc.). Similarly 2 Esdr. 6:56–59; 7:11; 9:13; *Apoc. of Baruch* 14:18, 19; 15:7; 21:24. As to the hiding of the mystery from the angels see *Slav. Enoch* (Charles, 1–50 A.D.) 24:2; 40:3, and cf. Eph. 3:10; 1 Pet. 1:12; Matt. 24:36.

[2] Hermas, *Vis.* 1:1, 6; 2:4, 1, cc. 4, 5; *Mand.* 12:4; cf. Rev. 21:7, *v. l.*, Just. M. *Ap.* 1:10; 2:4, 5, etc.

[3] The most conspicuous are ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, διάβολος, ἄρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων, ἔργα ἄκαρπα, etc. Cf. Holtzmann, *Einl.*[3], p. 259. The preëxistent treasury of deeds 2:10 is an apocalyptic trait, cf. *Slav. Enoch.* 53:3.

have introduced the peculiar Pauline διό five times, twenty words unknown to the New Testament save in the greater Pauline Epistles, with only seventy-six that can in any sense be considered unusual to Paul.[1] Nay, we have the positive information from Origen that in the apocalyptic passage 1 Cor. 2:6–16 the "Scripture" quoted by Paul (vs. 9) is from the *Apocalypse of Elias*. If now on the authority of Epiphanius,[2] the Scriptural (λέγει) quotation Eph. 5:14 is also taken "from the *Apocalypse of Elias*," we shall not only find it easy to explain a few peculiarities of language and style, but very hard to explain how an imitator should hit upon the same obscure, unnamed book for the further development of Paul's cosmology, which Paul himself had in mind when writing to the Corinthians that he could, *if he chose*, "speak God's wisdom in a mystery, even the wisdom that hath been hidden, which God foreordained before the worlds unto our glory, which none of the Rulers of this world (ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου) knoweth" (cf. Rom. 16:25–27; Eph. 3:3–5, 9 f.; 6:12 and the passages from *Slav. Enoch, Ass. Mos.*, etc., above cited).

Paul used apocalypse.

In Philippians the situation is again changed. Paul is not writing to correspondents more or less indirectly related to him, but to his intimates, and the most beloved of all his churches (1:3–8; 4:15). We are not surprised to find it the most epistolary in form of all his letters, abounding in special and local references, which, on the one side, have conduced to the abandonment of former attacks upon its genuineness, but, on the other, involve us in unanswerable problems as to the precise historical situation.

Character, occasion, and analysis of Phil.

[1] Phil. alone has thirty *hapaxlegomena*.

[2] Cf. Iren. 4:22, 1 with Eph. 4:9 and Just. M. *Trypho* 72.

The structure of the epistle is as follows: —

1. **Salutation and epistolary thanksgiving and prayer,** 1:1–11.

2. **Report of Paul's condition and prospects,** 1:12–26, passing in 27–30 to

3. **Doctrinal exhortation to unity through imitation of the mind of Christ, whose exaltation was through humbling himself**; thus Paul's work will stand in any event, 2:1–18.

4. **Personal business, with commendation of Timothy and of Epaphroditus,** 2:19–30.

5. **Doctrinal section.** Warning against the "concision." Righteousness by the Law *vs.* righteousness by faith, c. 3.

6. **Exhortations, personal business, and acknowledgment of gift. Farewell,** 4:1–9, 10–20, 21–23.

Date.

Lightfoot's argument from the relation of Philippians to Romans in style and language for a date anterior to the group Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon,[1] has won the assent of Hort, but, as this distinguished scholar himself admits,[2] of so few beside that it need only be mentioned alongside of the similar one for the late date of Galatians. Not a year or two of time, but circumstance, subject, and literary relation chiefly modify an author's style. *Per contra* the letter gives clear evidence of a decided change for the worse in Paul's situation. The references to his bonds in the letters to Asia are quite compatible with the relative freedom enjoyed during the "two years" of Acts 28:30 f., though one of the occasions of the letters from Asia he is answering would seem to have

[1] Essay on the "Order of the Epistles of the Captivity" in *Comm. on Phil.*

[2] Rom. and Eph. *Prolegomena*, 1895.

been a disheartening report of his affairs (Eph. 3:13; 6:22; Col. 1:24; 4:8; cf. Philem. 22) as looking toward an unfavourable issue. In Philippians Paul is still hopeful (1:25; 2:24), but far from buoyant, and his hope is fixed not on earthly helpers, nor on human probabilities of release — though, for the comfort of his beloved Macedonians he argues that his indispensableness to them will be a motive even with the Disposer of all events. The difference between Philem. 22 and Phil. 1:19–30; 2:12–18 is that in the former Paul is preparing friends for news of his release, in the latter for news of his execution.

Circumstances of Paul.

Nor is this a sudden, unheralded change, nor mere subjective fluctuation of the Apostle's hopes. Paul has been through a period not only of "sorrow" (2:27), but of actual physical "hunger" and "want" (4:12–14), which Epaphroditus, bearer of a belated gift from the Philippians, had been able to supply only at the risk of his life (2:30; 4:14, 18). For in Philippi they have not only had time to hear of this calamitous turn in the affairs of their Apostle, and to respond to it by despatching the aid which previously they had lacked opportunity to send (4:10), but had heard also of what, but for the courage and determination of their messenger, might have proved a "sorrow upon sorrow." For while in pursuit of his commission, Epaphroditus had been taken "sick nigh unto death" (2:26 f., 30).

Paul has still friends around him, — few, but faithful. But his preaching has ceased, of which his enemies think to take advantage, not knowing the Apostle's faith in the Master's promise (Matt. 10:18 and parallels) that his very bonds should preach for him (1:13), and in his own principle that "we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth" (2 Cor. 13:8; cf. Phil. 1:15–18). Thus "the things

which happened unto" him, certain very definite, and, obviously to the Philippians who have heard of them, calamitous further restrictions of his liberty, have, to Paul's noble optimism, "fallen out rather unto the progress of the gospel." But the crisis, involving life or death (1:20–24), is very near; so near that, but for their anxiety, Paul would have retained Epaphroditus as go-between. As it is, he will send Timothy, his last remaining faithful adherent," forthwith, so soon as I shall see how it will go with me."

Later than end of Acts.

This situation cannot reasonably be brought within the two years of unhindered preaching, with which Paul began at Rome in his own hired house of Acts 28:30 f. Since then new hardships have come. But these and all the world of toil and conflict are fast receding from view. The Apostle repeats again and again his loving "farewell" (3:1; 4:4), but he has ceased to "mind earthly things"; he is "pressing on toward the goal unto the prize of his high calling," to "know Christ and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, becoming conformed unto his death if by any means he may attain unto the resurrection from the dead" (3:10–14).

Composite?

Whether we have in Philippians more than one letter of this farewell correspondence is a subordinate question.[1] The breaking of all the waves of criticism about 3:1 ff. is an indication, as Holtzmann says, of a probable hidden reef. We have at least in 2:1–18 and chapter 3 two distinct doctrinal sections, each followed by an ending of the usual epistolary character, 2:19–30, and chapter 4, and the abruptness of the change at 3:1 ff. remains to be explained. The

[1] Polycarp's allusion to "letters" is either a *plurale tantum* (cf. 11:3), or possibly includes 1 and 2 Thess. as also Macedonian. If more than one letter had survived to Polycarp's day it would have survived to ours.

Judaisers in Rome have sunk beneath Paul's feet in 1:18. Has his peace of mind been suddenly broken again by news of their inroads at Philippi? There is no mistaking the portrait of 3:2 ff. in comparison with 2 Cor. cc. 10–13. "Hebrew" descent, "circumcision," "righteousness of the law," "glorying in the flesh," "enmity to the cross" (cf. Gal. 6:12–14),—these traits are familiar; but are we to suppose that it is such men as followed Barnabas and Cephas at Antioch, or, in fact, any Christian Jew in fellowship with the Apostles, of whom Paul now writes (vs. 19), "whose end is perdition, whose god is the belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things"?[1] We are reminded rather of a letter of Paul to Ephesus (Rom. 16:18) and of another Apostle who writes to the churches in Asia to beware of the "false apostles" (Rev. 2:2), men of the "synagogue of Satan, who say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie" (3:9; cf. Phil. 3:2 f.); though here libertines and Judaisers are differentiated. Paul's antidote for the poison is the old rule (3:1, 16) of conformity by faith to the death and resurrection of Christ.

Relation of parts.

If Phil. 3 f. be a separate letter it will have shortly preceded chapters 1, 2 (cf. 4:21 f. with 2:20 f.) as an acknowledgment of the gift conveyed by Epaphroditus (4:18), and answer to the Philippians' letter (4:10). Paul's final teaching then (2:1–18) will have supplemented the brief exhortation of 4:1–9 with that incom-

[1] Libertinism could find no shadow of sympathy in the mere narrowness of the converted Pharisee still clinging to the Law. These are not "the circumcision," but (to substitute Paul's own term for a Judaism which sought to rival Christianity in its influence on the heathen world by conforming Mosaism to heathenism) they are "the concision." We may well employ the word in place of the cumbrous expression "syncretistic Judaism."

parable picture of "the mind of Christ," 2:5–11, according to the saying, "He that humbleth himself shall be exalted" (Matt. 23:12). For the ideal humanity is not of him who was made in the image of God, yet counted it a matter to be seized by robbery (ἁρπαγμόν) to be "as God, knowing good and evil" (Gen. 1:27; 3:5), but of a "second Adam," who being, in a higher and truer sense, "in the form of God, humbled himself and became obedient even unto the death of the cross."

The *Commentaries* of Lightfoot on Phil. and on Col. and Philem. are supplemented by the posthumous *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul*, 1895, with comments on Eph. extending only to 1:14. See also Hort's Rom. and Eph. *Prolegomena*, 1895. The two volumes by T. K. Abbott on Eph. and Col. and by M. R. Vincent on Phil. and Philem. in the *International Commentary Series* give the most recent special discussions in English, but should be compared with those in the *Bible Dictionaries*, *Encyclopædia Brittanica*, and *New Testament Introductions*. For German literature see Vincent (*op. cit.*), pp. xxx and xl *sq.*, as to Phil.; and Abbott (*op. cit.*), pp. xxxv–xl and lxii–lxv, as to Eph. and Col.

CHAPTER VI

THE SECONDARY CANON OF PAULINE EPISTLES: THE PASTORAL EPISTLES AND HEBREWS

Early classification.

THE distinction of the Muratorian Canon between Paul's letters to the Seven Churches, and those which, though "written from personal feeling and affection, are hallowed nevertheless in the respect of the Catholic Church for the arrangement of ecclesiastical discipline," is by no means peculiar to that document, and may well go back even to Marcion's day, for the *typus septiformis ecclesiæ* is well known to early Latin writers. We have seen that Hebrews also, when in danger of losing its ancient position of respect, found friends in the East who could discover reasons for attaching it at the end of this secondary Pauline canon in spite of its un-Pauline characteristics and the tradition declaring it non-apostolic, which in the West was still too strong to be disregarded.

Use made of the Pastoral Epistles.

Marcion cannot have been ignorant of the Pastoral Epistles, which are known to Ignatius and Polycarp; nor would he have scrupled to eliminate anything obnoxious to his beliefs if they had occupied to his mind the same position as the primary Pauline canon. His omission was not due to their private character, for he retained Philemon, which the Church classed with them as also private. It may perhaps be explained in part by the use to which we are told they were put in the churches, and the resultant treatment of the text. For his "Scripture" Marcion required

from the Church only its "Gospel" and "Apostle." He had no use for its "orders of ecclesiastical discipline" mainly directed against teachers of his own type, and without any such pretences of being a "diligentissimus explorator," as Tertullian imputes to him, he might well regard this somewhat mixed mass of directions, regulations, exhortations, and denunciations, in 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus as, on the whole, falsely purporting to come from Paul. If such was Marcion's judgment it agrees with the great majority of modern scholars, though the present tendency is toward fuller justification of the Church's tradition. Critics generally admit (i) that fragments at least of genuine letters of Paul to Timothy and Titus are here present;[1] (ii) that neither the regulations of church order, nor, in their general traits, the heretics opposed, nor the mode of opposition, are altogether out of relation to the later Pauline period; (iii) that many whole phrases, not merely in the epistolary parts, but even in the portions regarded as interpolated into the genuine historical framework, are Pauline, whether borrowed from the primary canon or derived from tradition. On the other hand, the writing of three such letters as these, as they stand, by the Apostle, is declared to be incompatible with the historical situation presupposed, and with their features of language and style. Accordingly, the prevailing efforts of criticism are in the direction of separation of those elements which may be taken to have formed

[1] Nearly all critics admit at least 2 Tim. 1 : 1 f., 15–18 ; 4 : 9–21 as genuine (so Hausrath, Pfleiderer, von Soden, *et al*). Many divide these genuine elements between *two* letters of Paul to Timothy and find traces of others in 1 Tim. 1 : 1 ff. ; Tit. 1 : 1, 4, 12–15. See *e.g.* McGiffert, *Ap. Age*, p. 408, who regards only 1 : 13 f. ; 2 : 14–3 : 17 ; 4 : 3 f. as spurious in 2 Tim. ; but two letters are combined.

the original letters from the material — Pauline or otherwise — which early church editors have interpolated to adapt these private notes to the public uses of "ecclesiastical discipline."[1]

Logical analysis.

A brief summary of the contents will show that criticism has some ground for declaring the Pastoral Epistles, especially 1 Timothy, to be characterised in part by the desultory, general, sometimes incoherent structure of ecclesiastical compilations rather than Paul's close-knit, logical sequence. The structure of 1 Timothy is as follows: —

i. **Salutation,** 1:1, 2.

ii. **Charge to refute heretics,** 1:3–20 [vss. 12–17, Thanksgiving of Paul for his "trust"].

iii. **Order in church services, and appointment of officials,** cc. 2, 3.

iv. **Duties of the minister**: against false teaching, in organisation, and administration of the Church, and the instruction of various classes. Farewell, cc. 4, 5, 6:1–21*a* [vss. 11–16, 20, 21, personal charge with the "trust"], 21*b*.

In 2 Timothy we have: —

i. **Salutation, thanksgiving, and exhortation to loyalty to the Apostolic trust,** 1:1 f., 3–14.

[ii. **Personal conditions,** 1:15–18; perhaps displaced.]

iii. **Doctrinal section.** Charge to loyalty continued. Faithful subordinates to be chosen as against unworthy teachers, 2:1–4:8 [2:20–26, mirror of "the Lord's servant"].

[1] The fundamental critical work on the Pastoral Epistles is that of H. J. Holtzmann, 1880. The most thorough and recent attempt at documentary analysis, summing up the work of predecessors, is by Hilgenfeld, arts. in *Zts. f. w. Th.*, 1897. F. H. Hesse's monograph, *Entstehung d. N. T. Hirtenbriefe*, 1889, seems to have suggested the view of McGiffert.

iv. **Personal data, greetings, farewell,** 4:9–18, 19–21, 22.

The Epistle to Titus has the following structure: —

i. **Salutation,** 1:1–4.

ii. **Directions in church appointments in view of heretical teachers,** 1:5–16.

iii. **Directions to the minister as to his own administration and teaching,** 2:1–3; 3:11.

iv. **Personal business and farewell,** 3:12–15.

Content of 1 Tim.

After address and greeting (1:1 f.), 1 Timothy plunges at once into an attack upon heretical teachers of a mythologising, antinomian type (3–11), as against whom Paul thanks God for the sound doctrine intrusted to him, though once a persecutor (12–17). Timothy must be heir to this trust (18–20). Chapters 2–3 turn to matters of church order. The proper course as to intercession in public worship (2:1–7), conduct of the women (8–15), office of bishops (3:1–7) and deacons (8–13) is set forth as necessary for Timothy's instruction in case of delay in Paul's coming (14–16). Chapter 4 returns to denunciation of the heretics. As against their ascetic, encratite practices and mythologising superstitions (1–10), Timothy is exhorted to preach "the wholesome doctrine" as a disciplined and authoritative teacher (11–16). His duties toward the various classes in the Church are defined, in his relations to the elder and younger of both sexes (5:1 f.) in enrolment of "widows" (3–16), in ordination of elders (17–22) [here a disconnected direction as to Timothy's diet (23–25)], and in ameliorating the relations of slaves to masters (6:1 f.). The heretical teacher is described, vaunting the disputatious sophistries he preaches for money (6:3–10), as against the true man of God (11–16). A special charge for the rich (17–19) and to Timothy to guard "the

trust" against the "profane babblings" of Gnostics, closes the epistle (20 f.; cf. 2 Tim. 1:13 f.; 2:16).

Content of 2 Tim.

The second epistle begins with a similar appeal to Timothy to "guard the good deposit," prefaced in this case by the usual Pauline thanksgiving and prayer (1:1–14). After a disconnected item referring to kindness shown the writer by the Ephesian Onesiphorus when in Rome (1:15–18), Timothy is exhorted to carry on the work of Paul (2:1–13). He is given the pattern of the Lord's servant[1] as against the "profane babblings" and "foolish and ignorant questionings" of the heretics (14–26). Reproof of these impostors is drawn from the *Repentance of Jannes and Jambres*,[2] a work perhaps included among the "Scriptures inspired of God," which are of service for this, and which expressly foretell, by the Spirit, their coming, as a feature of the last times (c. 3; cf. 1 Tim. 4:1 ff. and 2 Thess. 2:3). Timothy, accordingly, must be a faithful preacher, evangelist, and successor to Paul, whose martyrdom is immediately at hand (4:1–8). The letter concludes with epistolary matters (4:9–22).

Content of Tit.

The same burden is laid on Titus. Paul is the trustee of a divine message (1:1–4). Titus was left in Crete to provide an ecclesiastical organisation capable of defending "the wholesome doctrine" against unruly talkers and deceivers, the worst of whom are

[1] The incongruity of 2:20–26 with the context consists in the fact that here the pattern is furnished Timothy apparently for application to *himself* (22 f.), whereas the context (2:2, 14–19; 3:1–13 has to do with the type of faithful teachers he must select (2:2). Moreover, the faults warned against in 2:20–22 cannot be imagined in Timothy.

[2] This work was known to Pliny, who died in 79 A.D. Origen (on Matt. 27:8) is our informant of the source of Paul's reference.

Jews, though our author fails to distinguish between the asceticism of one type of Gnostic (1:14, 15) and the licentious and superstitious speculations of the other (1:5–16).

Besides appointing suitable elders, or bishops (1:5–9), Titus must teach all classes in the Church, young and old of both sexes, slaves and masters (c. 2); and bid them show the effect of the gospel of the divine love in orderly behaviour to the world around, shunning the disputatious superstitions of the heretics (3:1–11). The epistle ends with a few words of business (3:12–15).

Historical situation in 2 Tim.

The point of departure for determining the historical situation implied in these letters must necessarily be 2 Tim. c. 4; for whether we consider their content as a whole, combating heretical tendencies by means of a wholesome tradition ("the good deposit") in the hands of a well-disciplined ministry; or their closely related phraseology, it will be obvious that no broad separation can be made. The three are certainly companion letters, and in 2 Tim. c. 4 we have at least one clearly defined historical situation. It is essentially the same as in Phil. 2:17, where we have the same remarkable metaphor as in 2 Tim. 4:6. Only matters have advanced one step nearer the goal of martyrdom (Phil. 3:14). The libation is already being offered, the course is fully run (4:7). Timothy, who was then waiting to be sent "shortly" to Philippi, has been despatched. This farewell letter is to commit to him the good fight Paul has finished (vs. 7 f.; cf. 1 Tim. 6:12 ff.). Of those present in Col. 4:10–14, Luke alone is left. Demas has deserted. Others now in Asia also forsook him, though one faithful friend from Ephesus has gone to a heavenly reward for the courage with which he had made his way to Paul's prison and relieved his wants (1:15–18).

With these conditions the tone of 1:1–14; 2:1–13 is thoroughly in harmony. The epistle is the last legacy to a "beloved child"[1] of a martyr whose only treasure is the "good deposit" of the gospel revelation, a trust greater even than that of the ancient oracles of God (Rom. 3:2; 1 Cor. 4:1).[2] Genuinely Pauline is the conception of this Gospel as the calling of God in the precreative gracious choice of us in Christ, a mystery hidden from times eternal, until manifested by the shining forth of Christ (1:9 f.; cf. Tit. 1:2 f.; 2:11–14; Eph. 1:3–14; 2 Cor. 4:4–6). Equally inimitable is the Pauline consciousness, preeminently characteristic of 2 Timothy, that his Gospel is a special word of God, a "trust" for the world. Nor would the writer of Philippians in transmitting this sacred trust, under essentially the same conditions, have omitted a parallel to the warning of Phil. c. 3. The portrait of the false teachers in 2 Tim. 2:14–3:17; 4:3, 4, while probably interpolated (2:19*b*–26? 4:3f.?), may therefore be largely genuine. For Paul believed in a "falling away" in "the last times" partly on the basis of such "Scripture" as underlies chapter 3 (cf. 2 Thess. 2:3 ff.), and, in the main, the apostates must be admitted to resemble the "concision" of Paul's day (cf. 2:18 with 2 Thess. 2:2; 1 Cor. 15:12 and Tit. 1:14–16; 3:9; 1 Tim. 1:4–7; 4:1–7 with Col. 2:8–10, 16–18, 20–23) far more closely than the anti-Jewish Gnostics of the second century.

Consistent with the epistle as a whole.

But in chapter 4 itself we find representations irreconcilable with this historical situation. Verses 9, 11–18, 20, 21*a* compel us to assume that Paul had

Incompatible elements.

[1] The supposed incongruity with Timothy's age and experience thus disappears from this passage.

[2] In 1:12 render according to margin (R. V.) comparing vss. 13, 14; 1 Tim. 6:20; Tit. 1:3.

recently been at Troas, Corinth, and Miletus. Moreover, in spite of desertion by friends he has made a successful defence before the Gentiles, and is greatly encouraged.[1] If the verses named are inseparable from 2 Timothy, they force us to assume that Paul was released from his imprisonment in Rome, made considerable journeys in Greece and Asia, revisiting Ephesus, in spite of Acts 20:25, 38, was subsequently reincarcerated in Rome, and repeated the experiences which, in Philippians, had already led him almost to the goal of martyrdom.

Now, in the absence of any evidence for it[2] outside the Pastoral Epistles themselves, such a repetition of Paul's "course" is highly improbable, especially in view of Acts 20:25, 38.[2] It cannot indeed be said to be insupposable. To the martyr also there sometimes comes an unexpected reprieve. Years after he may utter a second time his last farewells. But that which, under such circumstances, he will *not* do, is to return to his former leave-taking, and, with no reference to having used the figure before, borrow thence the phraseology for his parting legacy. This is the culminating reason[3] for regarding 2 Tim. 4:6–8 as written from the *same* captivity as Phil. 2:16–18, not

[1] With 2 Tim. 4:17 f., cf. Acts 23:11 and 2 Cor. 1:10.

[2] The passage in Clement of Rome, c. 5, is at least ambiguous. The mention in the Muratorian Canon of a "journey to Spain" rests on Rom. 15:28 and is destitute of support in history or tradition.

[3] Others of importance are: (i) the extreme improbability of Paul's escape from the Neronian slaughter of 64 A.D.; (ii) the situation and presuppositions of the Pastoral Epistles themselves, as *e.g.* the youthfulness of Timothy, 1 Tim. 1:18; 4:12; 5:1; 2 Tim. 2:22, the limitation of their scenes to the sphere of Paul's earlier activity, without mention of Spain; (iii) the impossibility of framing a consistent idea from them of Paul's movements or circumstances.

more than a few weeks later. The consequence is unavoidable that vss. 9, 11–18, 20, 21 *a*, 22 *b*, whose whole tone is as different from the preceding as the implied historical situation, were written by Paul on some much earlier occasion.[1] The only alternative is the highly improbable supposition that such data as 2 Tim. 4: 9–13 were forged out of whole cloth for the express purpose of deception.

Pastorals are either spurious, composite, or fall outside the known life of Paul.

The evidence of compilation out of various Pauline fragments is not surprising in view of the phenomena of Romans and 2 Corinthians, and would go far to explain the historical difficulties confronted when the genuineness of the letters in their present form is maintained. For it has come to be almost universally admitted that no place can be found for them within the known life of Paul. But thus far we have only a clew. It must prove its helpfulness in explaining the well-known problems of these epistles before being adopted as a theory.

The difficulties are of three classes: (i) as to historical situation; (ii) as to the implied ecclesiastical organisation and doctrinal development, both orthodox and heretical; (iii) as to style and vocabulary.

(i) One of the two irreconcilable historical situa-

[1] But for Acts 21 : 29 we should say with confidence, Paul is writing to some unknown friend (in Macedonia ?) shortly after the hearing before Felix, Acts 24 : 1–21 (N. B. vss. 9, 16, 21, and cf. 17 f. with Acts 23 : 11, and vs. 14 with Acts 21 : 27 ; 24 : 18). Lucht, Overbeck, and J. Weiss (*Absicht etc., der Apg.*, 1898, p. 39) have thrown serious doubt on the historicity of Acts 21 : 29 as wrongly explaining the assault. In that case Trophimus might really have been left in Miletus sick on this occasion. The resemblance of 2 Tim. 4 : 17 f. to 2 Cor. 1 : 10 suggests rather Macedonia, shortly before the coming of Titus (2 Cor. 2 : 12 f.), the defences alluded to having been made in Ephesus (Acts 19 : 38 ; 2 Cor. 1: 9 ; Rom. 16 : 4, 7). The genuine elements of Tit. will then be slightly earlier. See below.

tions of 2 Tim. c. 4 is entirely adapted to a known situation of Paul's life, and the other to an earlier, with or without error in Acts 21 : 29. That of Tit. 3 : 12 f. is not known, but these verses might have been written shortly before 2 Corinthians, when Paul (in Ephesus?), unable to count on the loyalty of Corinth, was planning to await the outcome in Macedonia and Epirus.[1] But herewith we have reached the limit of probabilities. The implications of 1 Tim. 1 : 3 ff. ; 3 : 14 ff. ; Tit. 1 : 5 ff. are simply improbabilities, not to say impossibilities, as they stand, whether the letters be placed in periods known or unknown of Paul's life. A long epistle of every sort of general instruction regarding church discipline could not possibly be required by Timothy under the implied circumstances, least of all when Paul was himself expecting to come shortly. And if Timothy had required instructions as to the appointment of officers for the church in Ephesus, are we to suppose that Paul had not a single individual whom he could nominate in the church founded by himself and diligently fostered "by the space of three years"? Had all the elders and bishops who came to meet him at Miletus (Acts 20 : 17, 28) suddenly resigned?

1. Implied relations of Paul to Timothy and Titus.

So with Titus. To say nothing of the fact that it is the absentee Paul, after a stay in Crete so brief that he has not even appointed elders in the churches, who yet must inform Titus of the character of the people of his own field — to say nothing of the extraordinary indictment of Cretans as a class in 1 : 12 f., it is incredible that Titus should require at any time subsequent to Paul's acquaintance with Apollos (3 : 13) such elementary instruction, especially when it merely supplements an oral charge, 1 : 5, and is coupled with a summons to the presence of the writer, 3 : 12.

[1] See *B. D.*, *s. v.* "Nicopolis," and cf. Rom. 15 : 19.

In both epistles Paul's relations to these intimate fellow-labourers are inconceivable in the known period, still more so the later we go. It cannot have been needful in a casual letter to Timothy for Paul to defend his apostolic calling, as in 1 Tim. 1:12–17, nor to assure him when speaking of it that he is speaking the truth and not lying, 1 Tim. 2:7 (cf. Rom. 9:1). On the other hand, the fancy of a forger is not likely to have framed the caution as to Timothy's diet, in 5:23.

2. Author's standpoint.

(ii) The burden of all three epistles is the fortifying of the Church against the inroads of the "concision" of Paul's time. But phrases and representations are present, especially in 1 Timothy, which imply fully developed systems of pseudo-Christianity,[1] closely corresponding to the heresies denounced in Jude, 2 Peter, Revelations, 1–3 John, and the Ignatian letters, and delineated for us by Irenæus and other Fathers as the doctrine of Cerinthus, the Jewish Gnostic contemporary of John in Ephesus. To this the letters oppose (*a*) the traditional teaching of the Church, to which various new terms are applied, such as "the pattern of wholesome words," "the words of the faith," "the wholesome doctrine,"[2] "the doctrine which is according to godliness," "the faithful word which is according to the teaching"; (*b*) ecclesiastical organisation and discipline, including not only bishops and deacons (Phil. 1:1), but the hitherto unknown order of enrolled "widows," or almoners. Both these methods are more external and conventional than we should expect from Paul. Paul's "gospel" is superseded by the Church's "teaching" (1 Tim. 6:1; Tit. 1:9; 2:10), and an advanced officialism testifies to an

[1] So 1 Tim. 6:20, implying the use of *gnosis* as a technical term.

[2] Six times.

age much later than that of 1 Cor. cc. 12–14, or even of Eph. c. 4, in which the government of the Church is a matter of spiritual endowment. These regulations resemble rather the early manuals of church order, such as the Διδαχή, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, etc. Even in 2 Timothy we realise that the charge to "the Lord's servant" in 2 : 20 (19*b* ?)–26 is addressed not so much to the real Timothy, as to the ideal candidate for holy orders.

3. Style and language.

(iii) Along with a number of Pauline characteristics [1] in style and language which are hard to explain as due to mere imitation, there is a pronounced un-Pauline character. This appears in an unusual proportion of unknown terms, seventy-four words found only in 1 Timothy, forty-six more found nowhere but in 2 Timothy, twenty-eight more nowhere but in Titus, with whole families of words such as σωφρονεῖν, σωφρονίζειν and the cognate forms, rare or unknown to Paul, new compounds of διδάσκειν, οἶκος, φίλος, substitution of different forms, as *e.g.* ἐν πᾶσιν (six times) where Paul writes ἐν παντί, implying a sudden and unexplained change in the Apostle's mode of expression.

Peculiar phrases appear also, often such as imply new modes of thought: εὐσεβῶς ζῆν, 2 Tim. 3 : 12 ; Tit.

[1] Observe *e.g.* the addresses and greetings, the item of personal news 2 Tim. 1 : 15–18, the connection in 1 Tim. 1 : 11*b*–13 ; and cf. γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς 2 Tim. 3 : 2 with Rom. 1 : 30, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου 2 Tim. 2 : 8 with Rom. 2 : 16; 16 : 25, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης 1 Tim. 1 : 11 with 2 Cor. 4 : 4, πιστεύεσθαι in the sense of "be entrusted," 1 Tim. 1 : 11 ; Tit. 1 : 3, and "be believed," 1 Tim. 3 : 16 and 2 Thess. 1 : 10 ; and the expression ἀφορμὴν διδόναι τινί 1 Tim. 5 : 14 and 2 Cor. 5 : 12 only (ἀφορμή occurs six times in the N. T., all in Paul). Note also the allusions to Paul's peculiar "mystery of the Gospel," the divine precreative εὐδοκία hidden from past ages but now manifested to men and angels in the elect people, 1 Tim. 3 : 16 ; 6 : 14–16 ; 2 Tim. 1 : 9, 10 ; Tit. 1 : 2 f. ; 2 : 12–14 ; 3 : 4–7.

2:12; διώκειν δικαιοσύνην, 1 Tim. 6:11; 2 Tim. 2:22; φυλάσσειν τὴν παραθήκην, 1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:12, 14; παρακολουθεῖν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, 1 Tim. 4:6; 2 Tim. 3:10. New terms in great number are applied to the heresy, *e.g.* βέβηλοι μῦθοι, μωραὶ ζητήσεις, γραώδεις μῦθοι, κτλ., and, on the other side, the phrases already referred to as designating "the wholesome doctrine," 1 Tim. 4:6; 6:1, 3; 2 Tim. 4:3; Tit. 1:9; 2:1, 8, 10. Herewith must be connected frequent references to "faithful sayings," 1 Tim. 1:15; 3:1; 4:9; 2 Tim. 2:11; Tit. 3:8, one of which, in commendation of "seeking the office of a bishop," cannot well be supposed current at an early period. References to the Old Testament, on the contrary, so characteristic of Paul, are conspicuous by their absence.

As against 133 un-Pauline words we have a striking absence of many which seem almost indispensable to Paul. Not merely is there no reference to the Church as the σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, but the very word σῶμα, used more than seventy times in the four great epistles alone, does not once occur. The whole family of ἐλεύθερος is absent, of φρονεῖν, of πράσσειν (for which these letters substitute ποιεῖν), of τέλειος, yes, even of ἐνεργεῖν, περισσεύειν and καυχᾶσθαι. Finally, as evidence which Dods admits to be "staggering," there is an absolute disappearance of the favourite Pauline particles ἄρα, διό, διότι, ἔπειτα, ἔτι, ἴδε, ἰδού, μήπως, ὅπως, οὐκέτι, οὔπω, οὔτε, πάλιν, ἐν παντί, πότε, ποῦ, ὥσπερ, and of the prepositions ἀντί, ἄχρι, ἔμπροσθεν, ἕνεκεν, παρά with the accusative, and even of σύν, for which our author uses μετά.

Inference: The Pastoral Epistles have been recast.

It is impossible to regard these phenomena as accidental. They coincide with peculiarities of style and correlation of thought, they are connected with a historical situation which belongs to the close of the century. They positively demonstrate an un-Pauline

element present in all three epistles, but most strongly marked in 1 Timothy and Titus.

A wise conservatism will yield so much as this, while refusing as yet to commit itself to any special scheme of documentary analysis, or even to the possibility of extricating the Pauline from the traditional and editorial material. We must simply recognise in the Pastoral Epistles a special group "hallowed in the respect of the Catholic Church for the arrangement of ecclesiastical discipline," but later formed than the primary Pauline Canon, and bearing the marks of much alteration, interpolation, editorial adaptation to this use, mainly on the basis of Paul's great legacy to Timothy of his "trust" in 2 Timothy, partly on fragments of notes to Timothy, Titus, and perhaps others; partly, no doubt, on traditional formulæ and teachings of the Apostle. They have passed through an experience similar to all known compilations of their class, a process of more or less unconscious accretion arrested only by the stereotyping hand of the Canon-maker.

Hebrews. Early treatment.

The anonymous epistle anciently superscribed "To the Hebrews," was early connected in Alexandria and the East with the letters of Paul. Even in the West, where the statements of all the Fathers down to the fourth century are opposed to Pauline authorship,[1] its position in the Canon, when admitted, was next to these. This fact may partly account for the popular belief in Alexandria which Pantænus, Clement, and Origen successively sought to harmonise with its manifestly un-Pauline characteristics; for in ancient manu-

[1] Besides Tertullian (see above, p. 33) and the Muratorian Canon, both Irenæus and Hippolytus are credibly reported by Stephan Gobar (in Photius) to have denied the Pauline authorship. Caius (ca. 200), Cyprian, Victorinus, and others count but thirteen Pauline Epistles.

scripts of the Pauline Epistles the titles ran: "To the Corinthians," "Galatians," "Romans," etc., the reader supplying tacitly the words "Epistle of Paul."

But for the strange decision of the English revisers "to leave unchanged the titles given in the Authorised Version," we might say, with Bruce, "That the Apostle was not the author of it is now so generally admitted that it is hardly worth while discussing the question."[1] Luther, Calvin, and Erasmus were already convinced of this; it was demonstrated in the *Introduction* of Ziegler (1791), and the commentaries of Schulz (1818), and especially of Bleek (1828). The proof rests primarily upon the author's classification of himself, in 2:3, with those whose relation to Christ was that of the second generation; a fact in itself fatal to the various attempts of ancient and modern times to claim for the epistle even an indirect derivation from Paul.[2] For it is certainly no translation, but, on the contrary, employs the most classical Greek of the New Testament in carefully framed periodic structure (1:1–4; 2:2–4; 7:20–22; 12:18–24), including even word plays (5:8 ἔμαθεν ἔπαθεν; 9:15–18 διαθήκη; 10:38 f., 11:37, 13:14 μένουσαν μέλλουσαν), and paranomasias (5:14; 8:7, 8).

An independent author.

Moreover, in spite of the author's unmistakable acquaintance with Romans and 1 Corinthians, if not Ephesians and Galatians,[3] as well, both form and content display the sturdiest independence. Even the

[1] *B. D.*, 1899, *s. v.* "Hebrews, Epistle to."

[2] Including the curious revival of the theory of Stier, Guericke (1842), Ebrard (1850), and Delitzsch (1857) by a recent writer in the *Bibl. World*, who has won the support of Ramsay (!), *Expos.*, June, 1899.

[3] For the parallel passages see Holtzmann, *Einl.*[3], p. 298, with the reference Heb. 10:30 below; also Von Soden, *Handcomm.*, p. 2.

Alexandrian Fathers had observed its un-Pauline style and vocabulary,[1] and Jerome the fact that, unlike Paul, this author depends exclusively on the LXX. version, in apparent ignorance of the original Hebrew. The only exception to this rule is the quotation in 10:30, which is borrowed from Rom. 12:19. Acquaintance with Philo is at least equally certain, affecting not merely the writer's doctrine of the ideal universe and creation through the Logos, but even his citation of the Old Testament in 13:5 in a form nowhere found save in *De conf. ling.*, 33. The Alexandrian apocryphon "Wisdom of Solomon" is also employed.

Logical analysis.

But the content will show that we have here neither an imitator of Paul nor a mere borrower from Hellenistic "wisdom," but a free combination of the results of Pauline theology with the current ideas of Alexandrian-Jewish philosophy, producing a genuinely new type of Christian thought.

The structure of Hebrews is as follows:—

[i. **Address, salutation, etc., wanting.**]

ii. **First doctrinal section and application.** Christ supreme over the universe, higher than all angels, and his administration than the Mosaic. Hence, warning against failure to enter his "rest" (kingdom), 1:1–3:6; 3:7–4:13 (14–16 transitional).

[1] As an impartial test of the diversity of style Professor Rendall cites the connecting particles: "In the Epistles of St. Paul εἴτις occurs fifty times, εἴτε sixty-three, ποτε (in affirmative clauses) nineteen, εἶτα (in enumerations) six, εἰ δὲ καί four, εἴπερ five, ἐκτὸς εἰ μή three, εἴγε four, μήπως twelve, μήκετι ten, μενοῦνγε three, ἐάν eighty-eight times, while none of them are found in Heb. except ἐάν, and that only once (or twice) except in quotations. On the other hand, ὅθεν which occurs six times, and ἐάνπερ which occurs three times are never used by St. Paul." (*Theol. of Hebrew Christians*, p. 27; quoted by Dods, *Introd.*, p. 182).

iii. **Second doctrinal exposition.** Christ the eternal High Priest after the type of Melchizedek, cc. 5–7 (5:11–6:12 digression for practical exhortation).

iv. **Third doctrinal section and application.** Superiority of the later, eternal form of worship corresponding to this priesthood, to the Mosaic forms. Hence warning to hold fast, 8:1–10:18; 10:19–39.

v. **Fourth doctrinal section and application.** The nature of faith as insight illustrated from Scripture. An encouragement to persevere, cc. 11, 12.

vi. **General practical exhortation, personal news, and farewell, c. 13.**

Nature and content.

With the general purpose of checking any disposition in his readers toward a Judaising eclecticism or deistic indifference,[1] the author presents the contrast of the new revelation with the old, which is primarily illustrated in the person of their respective mediators. In the one case are subordinate agents, angels and powers, which, great as they are, exist only for service to the heirs of salvation; in the other, the "heir of all things," the archetypal Man of God's eternal creative forethought, who in "Wisdom" is identified with the visible phase of the divine glory, the substantive counterpart of the eternal Being (1:3 = Wisd. 7:25 f.). Originally the agent of creation, he has now become the agent of redemption also, until the ultimate subjection of the universe to him is accomplished, chapters 1 and 2. And as in his cosmic functions Christ is exalted above the angels, to whom the present world is subject (2:5) and through whom the

[1] See the repeated applications of the argument, 3:12–4:16, 6:9–12; 10:19–39; 12:1–13:17. Relapse into Judaism, formerly regarded as the danger threatening the readers, would certainly not be described as "falling away from the living God," 3:12.

Law was given, so in the historical process of redemption he towers above Moses and Joshua, achieving a "rest" for the people of God, of which the "rest" of Canaan (Ex. 33:14) was a mere type and shadow; the real "rest" of God being that of the ultimate creative "sabbath," the period when with the abolition of the curse of death the universe is brought to the divinely contemplated ideal, c. 4. An exhortation to faith and obedience to this living, all-penetrating Logos of God, who is the one "with whom we have to do," leads over from the consideration of Christ as the Son of Man of Ps. 8, source and goal of creation, to the consideration of him in his redemptive work as the Son of God, typified in the Messianic priest-king of Ps. 110. After a digression (5:11–6:12) urging deeper religious insight, the "high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek" (Ps. 110:4) is elaborately interpreted as the ideal and eternal mediator with God, of whom the Aaronic priesthood was a mere type and foreshadowing. As the Sabbath of God had been treated (3:11–4:10) as

> The stupendous march
> Of grand eternity,

so now the Messianic temple is

> The unmeasured arch
> Of yon ethereal sky,

into whose holy of holies, the actual presence of God, Christ has passed with the blood of an efficient sacrifice, whereof the Levitical, unable in themselves to cleanse from sin, were mere types, cc. 5–10. This section on the relation of the Old Testament dispensation to the new as temporary and typical, winds up with a second exhortation to persistent faith, 10:19–39. The third section expounds the nature of faith, scarcely distin-

guishing it from *gnosis;* for it is set forth as "a faculty of the human mind, whereby it can make the future as if it were present, and the unseen as if it were visible."[1] A roll-call of heroes from the creation to Christ, who all "endured as seeing him who is invisible," "looking to the recompense of reward," and esteemed the present and material at its true pettiness as compared with the ideal and eternal, illustrates this definition, and leads over to the third and final exhortation to emulate this example, considering the nearness of that sublime consummation to which all had looked forward, cc. 11, 12. A few special practical admonitions and epistolary notes conclude the epistle, c. 13.

A letter; but to whom addressed?

In the form of a letter — for the local allusions in 6:10; 10:32–34; 13:7, 9, 18, 19, 23 admit no doubt that an actual local church is addressed by its teacher, now separated from it by special circumstances — in the epistolary form whose great capacities Paul had demonstrated, we have here one of the grandest of sermons. Theologically, the author stands midway between Paul and John, master not only of Pauline ideas, but of a style and rhetorical finish scarcely attributable to any other than one of the type of Philo, a Jew versed in the neoplatonism of Alexandria, as much at home in its Hellenised Jewish "wisdom" as in the Old Testament. But by whom, whence, and to whom was it written? For, whether by accident or design, the address and superscription, which either preceded the opening verse on the same sheet, or were written on an outside page or wrapper, have disappeared, leaving only the problematical tradition that it was sent "to the Hebrews."

If the tradition has a geographical sense, and is not a mere inference from the contents as adapted to those in danger of overrating the Old Testament, we

[1] Bruce, *B. D.*, 1899, *op. cit.* p. 334 *b.*; cf. Heb. 11:1.

must look — paradoxical as this may seem — last of all to Palestine itself. Not only would such an address be meaningless where the mass were Hebrews, but the very language is decisive, for all notions of an Aramaic original have long since been exploded.[1] Antioch or Syria has been proposed[2] as the home of Hebrew (?) Christianity, but with no advantage as regards the title, nor as to any local allusion save 6:10. Alexandria is favoured by many,[3] and finds support in the peculiar type of doctrine; for Hebrews stands almost alone in the New Testament in the degree to which it represents that fourth tendency of early Christian thought which Harnack defines as "universalism in principle and in practice,"[4] and which conceived the particularism of the Old Testament as a mere husk to be penetrated by allegorical interpretation. The Alexandrianism of the author, however, need not be assumed to have characterised the readers, and even the more telling argument that we have evidence in Egypt of native and Jewish Christian writings being differentiated as "according to the Hebrews" and "according to the Egyptians," is paralleled at Rome by inscriptions mentioning the name of one of the many Jewish synagogues as the Συναγωγὴ Ἑβραίων.[5]

Alexandria, or better Rome.

[1] The general abandonment of a Palestinian destination makes it superfluous to point out the inappropriateness of 3:12; 5:12; 6:2–5 to Jewish readers.

[2] So Rendall.

[3] So among others Ritschl, Volkmar, Hilgenfeld, Reuss, and Davidson.

[4] See p. 14. In his *History of Dogma*, (transl. Buchanan), i., p. 91, however, Harnack seems to regard even Heb. as not yet crossing the limit between Paulinism and Alexandrianism.

[5] Schürer, *Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom*, 1879, p. 16 f. In favour of a Roman destination are such leading critics as Holtzmann, Harnack, Zahn, and Von Soden. Wettstein in 1752 had already adopted this view and Alford in 1859.

The mention of Timothy, 13:23, and the most probable explanation of a special greeting to the recipients from the brethren of (or from) *Italy* combine with the fact that the earliest known use of the epistle is in the Roman church,[1] and that the truth regarding its un-Pauline origin was here so persistent, to make one of the Christian communities of Rome the most probable destination. This throws most light upon the references to the readers' experience in conversion, 2:3, earlier persecution, 10:32–34, which in the case of fellow-Christians had been "unto blood," 12:4, and munificence to the poor saints,[2] 6:10. True, there is no reference to the controversy between Jew and Gentile in the Church. All alike who follow Christ have come forth with him without the camp, encircling an altar whereof they who serve the tabernacle have no right to eat, 13:10, 13. But Paul had already triumphed in the breaking down of this wall of partition and slaying of this enmity, Eph. 2:14–17. Moreover, the supposed references to a tendency of the readers to relapse into Judaism, tempted by the magnificence of a ritual in current practice among them, are now generally recognised as fallacious.[3] Real Judaism has sunk out of sight.

Authorship.

Of all the conjectured names of authors only two need detain us. In Tertullian's day, in Africa, it was believed, whether by early conjecture or tradition, to have been written by Barnabas. To this the author's reference to his own conversion, 2:3, and his surprising errors in regard to temple ritual, 7:27; 10:11

[1] Used in forty-seven places by Clement, 93–95 A.D., also by Hermas, 120–140.

[2] In other cases this expression refers to the collections for Jerusalem.

[3] See the article of Bruce above referred to, *B. D.*, p. 337 *b.*, 338, and below under "Date."

(based on the error of Philo, *De special. Leg.* 23); 9:4 (against Ex. 26:35; 1 Kings 6:22), 21, are decidedly opposed (cf. Acts 4:36 f.). Luther's conjecture of Apollos, on the contrary, lacks only that which could alone entitle it to be considered more than a pleasing possibility, viz. some traditional or historical point of attachment. The description of Apollos, Acts 18:24–28, seems as if coined on purpose to represent this author, and has further support in 1 Cor. 1:12; 3:6; 4:6; 16:12; Tit. 3:13. Yet there is no answer to Rendall's demand: How could so well-known a name have disappeared? unless we ask in turn: How could any name borne by so great a writer disappear?[1]

Date. The destruction of Jerusalem is contemplated neither in retrospect nor in prospect. Neither the earthly city nor its temple are before the writer's mind. His antithesis is between the Old Testament religion of form and the New Testament religion of spirit, the "tabernacle" of the Pentateuch *vs.* the living temple of the Church. Not the actual ritual of the temple is a temptation to his readers to apostatise, but a Judaism on paper, a bibliolatry of the Old Testament, to which the church in Rome, under the influence of reviving rabbinism, in 70–100 A.D. may well have been peculiarly exposed.[2] Nor is it a pure Old Testament Judaism whose influence our author dreads, but "divers and strange teachings" with ascetic distinctions of meats, 13:9, and, if we may judge from the effort of chapters 1 and 2, tendencies, as in Colossæ, toward a "gratuitous self-

[1] The interesting theory just broached by A. Harnack, attributing Heb. to the joint authorship of Prisca and Aquila, comes to hand too late for more than mention as a third possibility.

[2] See p. 33 ff. on "Scripture" in the early Church, and cf. Jn. 5:39 f. (R. V.). Observe also the complaint of Ignatius above, p. 35.

humiliation and worshipping of the angels." The ordinances of the Law, "which are a shadow of the things to come" (Col. 2:17; cf. Heb. 8:5; 10:1), were inculcated in a mystical and eclectic spirit, reminding us rather of the false teachers of 1 Tim. 1:4, 7; 4:1 ff., 7; 6:3–10; 2 Tim. 4:4; Tit. 1:10 ff.; 3:9, etc.

The Judaism opposed is the rabbinic neo-Judaism.

Far from furnishing a motive to the author of Hebrews, the events of the Jewish war of 66–70 A.D. affect him indirectly, if at all. The destruction of the temple was the apotheosis of the synagogue, the downfall of the priest was the exaltation of the rabbi, and the cessation of the temple cultus gave a tremendous impetus to both orthodox and syncretistic worship of the letter of the Law. It is this propaganda of the Jewish scribe and theosophist which our author antagonises, not a living temple-worship. The fact that he rests upon the great letters of Paul is against a date earlier than 70, his silence as to Palestinian affairs against one immediately after. On the other hand, his mention of Timothy, and the copious use Clement of Rome has made of his letter makes it impossible to date it later than the reign of Domitian. The suggestion that both the author and his companions "from Italy" may have been exiled by this emperor is entirely reasonable (cf. 13:23 f.).

On "The Epistle to the Hebrews" see in addition to general works the following English authorities: Rendall, 1888, — with Appendix, 1888, — Westcott, 1892[2], Vaughn, 1891. On the "Authorship," Welch, 1898; "Theology," Milligan, 1899. The Pastoral Epistles are exhaustively treated by Holtzmann (*op. cit.*) but the attempts to discriminate a genuine element are mostly foreign. (Lemme, Renan, Beyschlag, Sabatier, Hesse, Hilgenfeld.) See McGiffert, *Ap. Age*, pp. 398–423.

PART III

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES

CHAPTER VII

1 PETER, JAMES, JUDE, AND 2 PETER

Various early Canons.

THE group of seven writings called "Catholic" (*i.e.* general, encyclical) is the latest formation of the Canon. 1 Peter and 1 John formed a nucleus universally received from a very early period. These still stand apart for Junilius Africanus (550 A.D.), though he explains that "very many add" the remaining five. Chrysostom's *Synopsis* mentions only three. Amphilochius (375–400 A.D.) notices that some say seven Catholic Epistles are to be received, others only three, viz. one of James, one of Peter, one of John. The Canon of the Syrian church, which at first had none, afterward followed the latter opinion. By the beginning of the fourth century, however, the Eastern church had come to include all seven, though much opposition was still offered, especially to 2 Peter. At Rome, apparently, Jude, 2 John, 3 John formed a special group in 175 A.D., unapostolic,[1] yet "received in the Catholic Church." James is ignored and 2 Peter unknown.

[1] This appears from the connection with "Wisdom" written by *the friends of* Solomon in his honour." So the *Muratorian Canon*, p. 50. But to read superscript*as*, for superscripti (Johannis duas), is violent.

1 Pet. not anonymous, or forged.

Among all these the position of 1 Peter is unique. Of the rest 1 John alone can presume to rival it in universality of early acceptance and in employment by the earliest Fathers. But 1 John is an anonymous composition, without superscription or local reference of any kind, owing its ascription to the Apostle purely to outsiders, who probably infer it from its obvious relation to the Gospel, which is itself anonymous. One must first ascertain in what sense the name of John has been properly associated with the Fourth Gospel — if properly at all — and thence draw one's inferences as to the three affiliated epistles. Hence, our consideration of these must be in connection with the Gospel. But the name of Peter belongs to 1 Peter in its own right. The letter has a definite address, occasion, superscription, location. It is either genuine or forged, or partly one, partly the other; and in either case the facts should be discoverable. The name of Peter was indeed a favourite mask for pseudonymous writings — we have, in fact, a whole pseudonymous Canon of "Gospel," "Acts" ("Preaching," "Teaching," and "Travels"), "Apocalypse," and "Epistles" of Peter; but our epistle stands not only on a completely superior level as regards both style and content, but is carried back by the positive evidence of employment by Polycarp and Papias, and probable use in Clement of Rome, to say nothing of the reference by name in 2 Pet. 3 : 1,[1] to a date when such forgery had as little motive as it had likelihood

[1] Cf. Clem. 5 : 7; 16 : 17; 33 : 8 with 1 Pet. 2 : 21 (ὑπογραμμός of the sufferings of Christ). Further Clem. 7 : 4 = 1 Pet. 1 : 19; Clem. 5 : 9 = 1 Pet. 2 : 9; Clem. 21 : 6–8 = 1 Pet. 3 : 1–9; Clem. 22 : 1 ff. = 1 Pet. 3 : 10–12; Clem. 30 : 2 = 1 Pet. 5 : 6; Clem. 33 : 7 = 1 Pet. 3 : 3; Clem. 49 : 5 = 1 Pet. 4 : 8; Clem. 59 : 2 = 1 Pet. 2 : 9. For the date of 2 Pet., whose witness to 1 Pet. is of course independent of its own authenticity, see below.

of unopposed success, and when we have, as a matter of fact, no evidence of the practice among Christian writers.

Formidable indeed must be the internal evidence which can outweigh such testimony; and formidable in all fairness must we acknowledge the opposing case to be. It rests (1) upon the content; (2) on the implied historical situation and date.

Logical analysis.

The structure of 1 Peter is as follows: —

i. **Salutation and epistolary thanksgiving,** 1:1 f., 3–12.

ii. **Doctrinal appeal.** Nature of the calling of Christians as an "adoption" in Christ, a Messianic living temple, a "people of God," 1:13–2:10.

iii. **Application.** (1) As to purity, 2:11 f. (2) As to subordination in the social organism, political, 2:13–17, and domestic, 2:18–3:7.

iv. **Special exhortation to submission under unmerited persecution,** 3:8–4:19.

v. **Exhortation to a Christlike spirit in church relations,** 5:1–11.

vi. **Personal greetings. Farewell,** 5:12–14.

Content.

After a superscription and salutation to the people of God in the principal provinces of Asia Minor, 1:1, 2, the author enters upon a prolonged doxology of the Pauline type for the revelation from heaven of the Gospel of salvation as key to the problem of the cosmos, 1:3–12. As the redeemed "people of God," the Messianic living temple, the spiritual Israel, their conduct should exemplify their calling and hope, 1:13–2:10. Heathen calumny will be silenced by such conduct; first, in the relations of social order, as citizens to magistrates, slaves to masters, wives to husbands, and reciprocally, 2:11–3:7; second, and more particularly, in the patient, Christlike bearing

of unmerited suffering and death, 3:8–4:6. Within the Church charismatic gifts should serve for reciprocal benefit, 4:7–11; in the present outbreak of persecution martyrs should make it clear that they suffer not for crime, but "for the name of Christ," and rest confident in God, 4:12–19. The elders are exhorted by their fellow-elder, a witness of the martyrdom of Christ, to be faithful shepherds, 5:1–11. Salutations and close, 5:12–14.

Pauline character.

From beginning to end this is the letter of a disciple of Paul.[1] We might say with Harnack, Holtzmann, Jülicher, and others, "In the absence of the first word alone no one would ever have guessed that Peter was the author." Not that at the late date everywhere implied Peter was not wholly in sympathy with Paul, to such a degree even as to make him appear the natural comforter and teacher of the churches of Paul's especial province; but that it is so hard to imagine the first and nearest of the Twelve so much more affected, apparently, by the teaching of Paul than of Jesus. Surely Peter did not go about preaching the doctrines of Paulinism! Papias informs us, with every probability in his favour, that Peter was accustomed to relate his personal experience of the doings and sayings of the Lord.[2] Not only is there no such sense of an independent message in this letter, but even the references to the sufferings of Christ seem to have a literary rather than a historical base. Its Christ is the suffering "Servant" of God of Is. 53.

Dependence on Eph. and Rom.

But the literary dependence goes much further. It is one of the most solid results of criticism, that our epistle stands in direct literary dependence on the great epistles of Paul, particularly Ephesians. The

[1] Seufert (*Zt. f. w. Th.*, 1881, pp. 178, 332) seriously advanced the theory that Eph. and 1 Pet. were by the same author.

[2] Corroborated by *Cl. Hom.* 17 : 19.

desperate attempt of B. Weiss to break the force of this by the theory that Paul is here the borrower, has, so far as known, but one adherent, and still stands a significant witness to the undeniable relation. The words of Sanday and Headlam will best express the judgment of conservative scholars :[1] —

> The resemblance [of Romans to 1 Peter] is too great and too constant to be merely accidental. In 1 Pet. 2 : 6 we have a quotation from the Old Testament with the same variations from the LXX. that we find in Rom. 9 : 32. Not only do we find the same thoughts, such as the metaphorical use of the idea of sacrifice (Rom. 12 : 1 ; 1 Pet. 2 : 5), and the same rare words, such as *συσχηματίζεσθαι*, *ἀνυπόκριτος*, but in one passage (Rom. 13 : 1–7 ; 1 Pet. 2 : 13–17) we have what must be accepted as conclusive evidence, the same ideas occurring in the same order. Nor can there be any doubt that of the two the Epistle to the Romans is the earlier. St. Paul works out a thesis clearly and logically ; St. Peter gives a series of maxims for which he is largely indebted to St. Paul. . . .
>
> This relation between the two epistles is supported by other independent evidence. The same relation which prevails between 1 Peter and Romans is also found to exist between it and Ephesians, and the same hypothesis harmonises best with the fact in that case also. The three epistles are all connected with Rome : one of them being written to the city, the other two in all probability being written from it.

Language. But the author of 1 Peter is not only in close literary dependence on Romans and Ephesians. He writes in excellent and flowing Greek, certainly needing no

[1] See Sanday and Headlam, *Intern. Comm. on Romans*, p. lxxiv ff. and Abbott, on Eph., p. xxiv ff. Cf. Rom. 9 : 25, 32, 33 with 1 Pet. 2 : 10, 6–8 ; Rom. 12 : 1–3, 6, 9, 13 ; 13 : 8–10, 11–14 with 1 Pet. 2 : 5 ; 1 : 14 ; 4 : 7–11 ; Rom. 12 : 9 f. with 1 Pet. 1 : 22 ; Rom. 12 : 16–18 with 1 Pet. 3 : 8, 9, 11 ; Rom. 13 : 1, 3, 4, 7 with 1 Pet. 2 : 13–17. Cf. also Eph. 1 : 3 with 1 Pet. 1 : 3 ; Eph. 1 : 5–15, 1 Pet. 1 : 5–13 ; Eph. 2 : 18–22, 1 Pet. 2 : 4, 5, 6 ; 3 : 18 ; Eph. 1 : 20–22, 1 Pet. 3 : 22 ; Eph. 3 : 5, 10, 1 Pet. 1 : 10–12 ; Eph. 3 : 9, 1 Pet. 1 : 20.

"interpreter," as we are told that Peter did, and uses the LXX. version as if acquainted with no other. Such considerations lead even Zahn,[1] after the example of many critics of all schools, to interpret 5:12 as indicating Silvanus as real author. Oriental custom, in fact, permits the great man to make the composition of a subordinate his own by the addition of a personal word or two at the end. His letters are thus written "by" or "through" the scribe.

Date and circumstances.

More serious than the difficulties which may, in part, be met by such a supposition, are those of date. The persons addressed are Gentile Christians (1:14, 18; 2:9, 10; 4:2–4; cf. 3:6), a "sowing" of God,[2] "no people" before their conversion, but now united by an inward bond into a "people of God" to the exclusion of Israel after the flesh (2:7–10; cf. Hos. 1:6–9; 2:1, 23). Their churches now extend beyond the Pauline provinces of Galatia and Asia northward to Bithynia and Pontus, southward to Cappadocia. If Paul is not already dead, why does Peter, or some one who speaks in Peter's name, invade this field? And why is Paul unmentioned, while both Silvanus and Mark are present? Moreover, the occasion and purpose are unmistakable. A fiery ordeal of persecution has broken forth to the dismay of the Church (4:12). No longer is it the petty social malice of Jewish and heathen neighbours, though this of course is still present (3:16; 4:4, 14); but now the adversary is a roaring and devouring lion, whose ravages are universal (5:8 f.), the penalties of murder and robbery are inflicted (4:15), one is liable to suffer capital pun-

[1] *Einleitung*, § 38, vol. II, p. 10 f.

[2] There is a play upon the word "Diaspora" (*i.e.* "scattered" or "sown"), as in Hos. 2:23, Jer. 31:27 on Jezreel. The same figure is beautifully employed in the sacramental prayer Διδ. 9:4.

ishment "as a Christian," in which case one must seek to "glorify God in this name." No candid historical exegesis can remove the figure of the Roman magistrate from 1 Pet. c. 4 as the inflicter of such penalties. It is Ramsay himself who confesses himself shut up to the dilemma: Either Peter survived, contrary to all tradition, until the reign of Domitian, before whose time there was no official persecution in the provinces, or 1 Peter is not genuine.[1]

Written from Rome.

We may be confident that Rome would not be referred to as "Babylon" (5:13),—for neither history nor tradition afford the slightest support for the literal interpretation of the word,—nor the conditions of "fiery" persecution be thus depicted, nor Paul's churches in Asia Minor thus addressed, until after his martyrdom at the hands of Nero. There are few, if any, who can think with Ramsay that the tradition of a common martyrdom for Peter and Paul at the

[1] *Church in the Roman Empire*, c. xi. The Neronian persecution was confined to Rome (see Arnold, *Neron. Christenverfolgung*, 1888), and was for a specific accusation of crime. Vespasian and Titus did not persecute. Domitian (81–96 A.D.) was at first tolerant, and even at the end of his reign will not often have gone outside of Rome for victims. The distinction in Pliny's inquiry (110 A.D.) regarding the very provinces of our letter and in Trajan's reply, is of utmost historical importance. It implies that at some time, probably under Domitian, magistrates had been authorised to punish Christians as such, the name itself, if confessed, being taken as evidence of crime, as recent legislators have proposed to treat the name Anarchist. Under Nero the *flagitia cohærentia nomini* had to be proved. Ramsay goes too far in saying that 1 Pet. implies that the distinction already existed in law. 1 Pet. 4:15 f. earnestly desires that such a distinction should be made. As yet the magistrates appear to act on the popular (unstatutory) assumption that the name implies the fact; cf. Tacitus, *Ann.* 15:44: quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat.

hands of the same mad tyrant, can be so far astray as to permit the survival of Peter beyond 81 A.D. Yet while the martyrdom of Peter is established by John 21:19 and Clement of Rome (cc. 5, 6), Dionysius of Corinth (250 A.D.) and Eusebius are the first to date it in the Neronian persecution. A later date, therefore, cannot be pronounced impossible.

Integrity seems to involve authenticity.

If the critic's knife could be wielded like the sword of Alexander, Harnack's solution[1] for this Gordian knot would be simple: The superscription (1:1) and salutation (5:12–14) are an addition of the Canon-makers.[2] But there is no natural cleavage; 1:1 is of a piece with all the section 1:1–2:11, and 5:12–14 agrees with it, as well as with 5:1 ff. We are driven to the question: If not Peter, who else? McGiffert's suggestion of Barnabas as this disciple of Paul, spiritual father of Mark, and witness of the crucifixion, surely cannot be outdone for plausibility. But how patronising even then will be the tone of 5:12! And how account for 5:1–4 unless Barnabas himself is trying to pass himself off as the real recipient of the charge of Christ to "tend his flock" in John 21:15–19? All things considered, 1 Peter may still represent to us the adoptive work of Peter, writing "by Silvanus" from Rome to the churches of Paul in Asia; the letter of an old man (5:1), whose charge from the chief Shepherd (John 21:15–17), and spirit of humility imbibed from him, lend a wonderful beauty and appropriateness to his encouragement to Paul's churches, through Paul's companion, that the doctrine they have learned is "the true grace of God," and his exhortation that they "stand fast in it." A disposition to

[1] *Chronologie*, vol. I, p. 451 ff.

[2] For a summary of objections to Harnack's theory see Jülicher, *Einl.*, § 15, 5, p. 136.

speak of persecution in Asia Minor in terms not yet strictly appropriate by one who writes from Rome under the immediate impression of the horrible foretaste of official persecution experienced in the last years of Nero, is less incredible than absolute pseudonymity at so early a date.

James. Is it a letter? Sense of superscription.

If the difficulties of 1 Peter are created by the very definiteness of its implied historical and geographical relations, the case is reversed in James. The superscription, 1:1, alone suggests that it is a letter, and nothing could be more indefinite than the characterisation of both writer and readers even here. The Fathers, true to their theory of apostolicity, usually pitched upon James the son of Alphæus as the writer, James the brother of John having been beheaded in 44 A.D. (Acts 12:1). Modern scholars agree that at the date whence this superscription derives, genuine or not, no other than the "pillar" of the Jerusalem church (Gal. 2:9; Mark 6:3; Acts 12:17; 21:18) can have been intended, both here and in Jude 1, this "brother of the Lord" (Gal. 1:19) being *the* James *par éminence.*

Date very early or very late.

Again, the address is such as to tax to the utmost the ingenuity of the many able scholars who have endeavoured to find a place for the epistle — or better, encyclical — within the lifetime of James, *i.e.* before 62 A.D. On account of the apparent reference to Pauline formulæ in 2:14–26[1] the attempt has been made to place it between 57 and 62, but critics of all schools are now agreed that the author wages no conscious polemic against Paul, whose fundamental doctrines could not have been dismissed, as it were, in an *obiter dictum.* The absence of any trace of the conflict

[1] Cf. especially 2:23 with Rom. 4:3; Gal. 3:6.

between Jew and Gentile, distinctive of 48–70 A.D., a silence as marked as in Hebrews, forces the defenders of the superscription, accordingly, to an extremely early date. Moreover, the ideal Israel addressed (1:1) becomes a more conceivable entity as the actual recipient of a letter, in proportion as we recede toward the early period when the confines of Christendom could be supposed to coincide with the boundaries of Syria. On the other hand, the notion of James writing encyclicals before Paul has even begun to write his epistles, is almost grotesque, to say nothing of the dubious relation which would then subsist between Jas. 2:14 ff. and Galatians and Romans. Certainly the Christendom of 1:1 is no less comprehensive than "the Israel of God" of Gal. 6:16, and the new "people of God" of 1 Peter. On the contrary, the conception is identical, as appears by comparison of verses 18, 21, where the same figure of the Diaspora ("sowing") of God shines through.[1] These "twelve tribes" are the one hundred and forty-four thousand of Revelation, twelve thousand from each tribe of the ideal Israel, precisely as Hermas, *Sim.* 9:17, 12, by the same expression, sets forth the ecumenical character of Christendom.

Implied circumstances.

But the time when James the Lord's brother could be supposed to send forth encyclicals as "bishop of bishops" to such a constituency had existence only after his death in the devout imagination of the Syrian church. The very idea of the new Israel as a "scat-

[1] Cf. also vss. 10, 11 with 1 Pet. 1 : 24. Attempts to exclude the Jews of Palestine itself from the circle addressed are incompatible with a date within the lifetime of James. The "twelve" tribes would be a preposterous form in which to address the Jews of the Dispersion. At the utmost we should have "the *ten* tribes," or "the Dispersion of the Twelve Tribes."

tered" people of God, chosen from the poor of the world to be heirs of the kingdom (Jas. 2:5), it was the lifework of Paul to bring home to the "pillars," whose horizon was limited to the circumcision (Gal. 2:9), and is present in Jas. 1:1 only by the mediation of 1 Pet. 1:1. Certainly James cannot have written to the conservative faction only as "the twelve tribes," and even when Paul, "after many years" (Acts 24:17), and at the risk of his life, had accomplished his peace-making mission, and could write that the enmity was slain, he is not likely to have issued an encyclical containing such language as Jas. 2:14–26, unless he wished to revive the conflict.[1]

Style and language.

Even more fatal to the authenticity of the superscription is the language. Before the founding of the Greek churches, while as yet the Gospel itself was in circulation only in Hebrew or Aramaic, if not earlier still, James, as recognised head of this Christendom, whose centre is Jerusalem and whose circumference a fringe of unknown proselytes, addresses an encyclical to the twelve tribes of Israel — and addresses them in mellifluous *Greek*, the most rhetorical of the New Testament with the single exception of Hebrews![2]

But with James the case is very different from

[1] The best English representative of the conservative position is J. B. Mayor, *Introd. to St. James*,[2] 1897. See also his art., "James, Epistle of," in *B. D.*, 1899.

[2] The forlorn hope of Bishop Wordsworth to make this epistle out the translation of an Aramaic writing may be "worth the attention of scholars" (Dods), but only as an example of desperate expedients. Dods himself explains that "in the Epistle of James words occur which would hardly be used save by a writer acquainted with Greek literature." It has thirteen words unknown to the LXX., seven more extremely rare words, twenty-seven common to LXX. and classics, but not in colloquial use, and even metaphors (1:17; 3:6) which have no explanation in the whole range of Jewish literature.

1 Peter. There the superscription and farewell are of the same texture as the epistle. Here the superscription — there is no other epistolary material — is both ill-fitting and historically inapplicable. Remove it, and we find in the writing itself every characteristic, not of a letter, but of a homily, or perhaps, better, a series of somewhat disconnected homiletical excerpts.[1]

Logical analysis.

So far as the exhortation has logical arrangement, it is as follows: —

i. **Salutation**, 1:1. (Probably a scribal conjecture.)

ii. **Commendation of the worthy object of desire** ("wisdom," the divine ethical ideal) as against unworthy (ease, wealth, etc.); lust *vs.* the [ideal] law, 1:2–11, 12–27.

iii. **Social discriminations violate the law of love**; faith (intellectual) no substitute, 2:1–13, 14–26.

iv. **The working of wisdom**: not shown in word, but in life, c. 3.

v. **The working of unworthy desire**: self-seeking, self-exaltation, a perilous worldliness, 4:1–5:6.

vi. **Inference**. patient continuance in faith and good works will insure the reward of saints, 5:7–20.

[1] Jas. has rightly been compared to the so-called Second Epistle of Clement of Rome, of which Lightfoot says (*Ap. Fathers*, ed. of 1891, p. 41): "We may now [since the discovery of the latter half containing the words 'Let us not think to give heed and believe now only, while we are being admonished by the presbyters; but likewise when we have departed home,' etc.] definitely regard it as the earliest Christian homily extant." True, Harnack (*Chron. d. a. Lit.*, p. 440) makes a tempting identification of 2 *Clem.* with the letter of Soter of Rome to Corinth (170 A.D.). If so, it simply shows that the good bishop's idea of letter writing was to work up an old sermon — not exactly the primitive conception. We may say the same of Jas.

Character and content.

The exhortation is of an extreme ethical type, not only undoctrinal, but anti-doctrinal (1:22; 2:19 f.; 3:1 ff., 13). The factors of salvation are two: the human, which consists in persistent well-doing, in accordance with the revealed moral law; the divine, which consists in the bestowal of "wisdom" in answer to believing prayer, "wisdom" having the pregnant ethical sense of the Old Testament (cf. Lk. 1:17). The trials of life (1:2–4), vicissitudes of fortune (9–11), and temptations of the flesh (12–15) perfect character, if met by this dependence on God (5–8, 16–18).

In view of this, our part is to be doers of the law of Christ, the revealed, "implanted word," the mirror of moral perfection; neither mere hearers nor mere talkers, but keepers of the divine requirement of purity and humanity (1:19–27). This "perfect law," "free" and "royal," demands, first of all, that we honour the poor man, our fellow-heir to the kingdom (2:1–13); second, that we carry out our profession in actual works of humanity (14–26). Moreover, it rarely becomes our part to assume the function of teacher; the tongue needs taming more than training (3:1–12). If the divine "wisdom" is in us, it will appear in a good life (13–18). The strife and evil of the world come from greed; beware of this kind of self-exaltation (4:1–10); also of that of criticising others (11 f.), and assuming to control in place of God (13–17). A denunciation of the oppressions of the rich (5:1–6), commendation of the patient suffering of Job and the prophets (7–11), with special warning against oaths (vs. 12), and a call to prayer and praise in the Church (13–18), with effort for the conversion of sinners (19 f.), somewhat abruptly conclude the exhortation.

We can hardly wonder that a brilliant and original

critic[1] should have soberly suggested a purely Jewish origin for a writing so exclusively moral and practical, which ignores every distinctive doctrine of Christianity, every question of the relation of Jew and Gentile in the Church, which has not a trace of "the new Messianism," and, with one more or less precarious exception, does not so much as mention the name of Christ, taking even its examples of patient suffering and effective prayer from the Old Testament (5:10, 17 f.).[2] Yet even if we admit the awkward position of the words Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in 2:1 to be due to their interpolation, the doctrine of the spiritual Israel, 2:5, the sole validity of the law of love, 2:8, and the gift of the divine spirit of wisdom, making us heirs of God, 1:18; 2:5; 3:13–18, would prove this writing not only Christian, but post-Pauline, however Jewish in type. The meagre indications of date by historical allusion permit us, indeed, if we would cling, at all costs, to the superscription, to disregard objections based on the traces of growing worldliness (2:1 ff.; 4:13 f.) and profession without practice (2:14 ff.; 3:1, 13); but the indications of date by *literary* relationship are really conclusive. Jewish or Christian?

The Pauline Epistles are certainly presupposed, both by the use of Pauline terminology and expres-

[1] F. Spitta, *Zur Gesch. u. Litt. d. Urchristenthums*, vol. II, 1896, and *Der Brief des Jacobus*, 1896. So previously L. Massebieau in *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 1895.

[2] And this is supposed to emanate from Jesus' brother! — In reality the treatment of the Christian faith as essentially a *nova lex* (cf. Barn. 2:6 καινὸς νόμος ἄνευ ζυγοῦ ἀνάγκης) belongs to the relatively late period of manuals of Gospel Teaching (Διδ.) and of the Oracles of the Lord. Acts 2:22 ff.; 3:13–26; 7:51–56; 8:35; 10:38–43 give a very different impression of the ideas dominant in the primitive Church in Jerusalem.

Relation to Pauline Epistles, Heb., and Clement of Rome.

sions;[1] for we have seen that dependence on the side of Paul is insupposable, and denial of the relation is unconvincing. But there is no attempt to deny this relation between James and 1 Peter (cf. 1 Pet. 1:1, 23 f. with Jas. 1:1, 18, 21; 1 Pet. 5:5, 9 with Jas. 4:6, 7, etc.[2]), and a comparison of the natural and logically connected way in which the "Diaspora" figure appears in 1 Peter with the irrelevant mention in James will show that the unbiassed judgment of Luther and Bengel, who recognise the priority of 1 Peter, is to be preferred to that of some moderns who would invert the relation. Finally, a careful comparison of the treatment of the relation of faith and works in Jas. 2:21–25, in the examples of Abraham (representing Israel) and Rahab (representing the Gentile world), with the complete parallels in Heb. 11:8 ff., 31 (cf. Rom. 4:17 f.), on the one side, and in Clement of Rome, cc. 10–12, on the other, will show that it is not Paulinism which our author consciously antagonises, but the doctrine of faith,

[1] Note δικαιοῦσθαι ἐκ πίστεως or ἐξ ἔργων, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, τελεῖν τὸν νόμον, the connected ideas κληρονομεῖν and βασιλεία, κρίνεσθαι ὑπὸ νόμου, κατακαυχᾶσθαι, τί τὸ ὄφελος, μὴ πλανᾶσθε, ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις, ὁλόκληρος, παραλογίζεσθαι, μέλη, παραβάτης νόμου, ἐλευθερία; and compare the passages 1:2, 3 (= Rom. 5:3, 4), 13 (against 1 Cor. 10:13), 18 (= Rom. 8:23), 21 (= Rom. 13:12), 22 (= Rom. 2:13); 2:4 (= Rom. 14:1), 5 (= 1 Cor. 1:27, 28; 2 Cor. 6:10; 8:9), 6 (= 1 Cor. 6:2, 4), 8 (= Rom. 13:8; Gal. 5:14), 10 (= Gal. 5:3), 19 (= 1 Cor. 8:4; 2 Cor. 11:14), 21 (against Gal. 3:6; Rom. 4:3), 24 (against Rom. 3:28; Gal. 2:16); 3:15 (= 1 Cor. 2:6, 14), 16, 18 (= 1 Cor. 3:3; 14:33; 2 Cor. 12:20); 4:1 (= Rom. 6:13; 7:23), 4 (= Rom. 8:7), 5 (= Gal. 5:17; Rom. 8:9, 11), 11, 12 (= Rom 2:1; 14:4), 15 (= 1 Cor. 4:19). Other striking examples are given by Holtzmann, *Einl.*[3], p. 335.

[2] Further cf. 1 Pet. 1:6, 7 with Jas. 1:2, 3; 1 Pet. 1:12, Jas. 1:25; 1 Pet. 1:22, Jas. 4:8; 1 Pet. 2:1, Jas. 1:21; 1 Pet. 4:8, Jas. 5:20; 1 Pet. 5:6, Jas. 4:10.

as a reader of Heb. c. 11 might misinterpret it. In Clement's still further elaboration of the same theme, we have a more advanced stage of the same effort to guard against a similar one-sided understanding.[1] Not the mere belief of the promise made Abraham's offering of Isaac and Rahab's receiving of the spies types of justification (Heb. 11:17, 31); according to Jas. 2:21, 25 it was faith *plus* works. Clement takes a further step and declares it to have been due to faith *plus* the *specific* works of "obedience" and "hospitality." The date of the homily will therefore be about 90 A.D., and the superscription a mistaken conjecture. Its interests are those of the Christianity of Rome, where we soon find it copiously employed by Hermas, not those of Palestine in 35–45 A.D.[2]

We have space for little more than mention of the brief epistle which comes to us once under the name

[1] Other passages showing dependence on Heb. are 1:17 (cf. Heb. 12:9); 2:17, 20, 26 (cf. Heb. 6:1; 9:14); 3:18 (cf. Heb. 12:11); 4:15 (cf. Heb. 6:3); 5:10 (cf. Heb. 13:7).

[2] With Newton we say: Hypotheses non fingo. Yet to correlate facts into working hypotheses capable of being tested is the essence of the Newtonian method. As a "working hypothesis" we may lay down the following possibilities: (i) The homily known as the Epistle of James originated in Rome ca. 90 A.D. and was delivered to and preserved by the "synagogue" addressed (2:2), possibly the actual (Christianised) Συναγωγὴ τῶν Ἑβραίων, which had previously received Heb. (ii) Later tradition of this local church attached the superscription (1:1) as it attached the title "of Barnabas" to Heb., in the belief that in the revered document it possessed an "Epistle of James"; but failed to secure recognition for it in general Roman use, for the same reasons which in the Muratorian Canon weigh against Hermas, and in western authorities generally against Heb. (iii) The superscription procured it admission to the Syrian Canon, but the early limitation of its use prevented its securing general acceptance.

Jude and 2 Pet. Logical analysis.

of Jude, and a second time in an expanded form, and with additions, as 2 Peter. With allowance for a chapter prefixed and another appended to 2 Peter, the same analysis will serve for both.

i. [Peculiar to 2 Peter.] **Salutation and general exhortation in one**, 1:1–11. Self-introduction of the Apostle, as spokesman for Christ and the prophets, 1:12–21. (In Jude, Salutation only, vs. 1 f.)

ii. **Denunciation of libertine teachers**, 2 Pet. c. 2 = Jude 3–16.

iii. **Exhortation to hold to the Apostolic word. Doxology**, Jude 17–25. [Expanded in 2 Peter into a further refutation of the error of those who pervert the Pauline Epistles and "the other Scriptures," denying the second advent, 2 Pet. c. 3.]

Sense of superscription of Jude.

The superscription of Jude has the negative advantage that next to nothing whatever is known of the person in question. Judas the Apostle (*son*) of James, Lk. 6:16; Acts 1:13, cannot be meant, for the addition, "brother of James," of course connects the writer with some noted individual, hence, doubtless, "James the Lord's brother." This Judas is mentioned in Matt. 13:55; Mk. 6:3 (Acts. 1:14?; 1 Cor. 9:5?), and, according to Hegesippus (175 A.D.), his grandchildren were, in the time of Domitian, (81–96), the living representatives (apparently the only ones) of the family of the Lord; these grandchildren were then living by manual labour on their farm, in Palestine, of thirty-nine acres.[1] What there is of history relating to Jude is, therefore, unfavourable to the idea that he issued an encyclical in the Greek language to the universal Church, at a time when the warnings of the Apostles were a thing of the past (17, 18), and the predicted heresies of the last times

[1] Euseb. *Hist.* 3:19, 20, 1.

were, in this writer's judgment, already corrupting the Church. The superscription is as indefinite as that of James, and was almost as widely disbelieved by the scholars of antiquity best qualified to judge, though here we need only suppose the words ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου to have been added by conjecture, and the local name to have disappeared at the end of verse 1. In their present form, however, both superscriptions are as ill-fitted to the respective writings as the papal tiara to the brow of the fisherman Apostle, and are certainly not deserving of more consideration than they received at the hands of the great Reformers, and of the Fathers in whose age the claim of apostolicity was first put forth in their behalf.[1]

To be classed with that of James.

Scepticism as to the two interrelated superscriptions enables us to preserve our respect for the contents of James and Jude. For while we must needs believe that actual brothers of Jesus, if they could be supposed to speak *ex cathedra* to the universal Church, would have had something to say of him, and as from him, we are more attentive to hear the exhortation of nameless later preachers against the worldliness and false teaching which, according to Hegesippus, left the Palestinian church as unstained as a pure virgin until the second century, if we know they are not attempting to impose upon their readers by false pre-

[1] Eusebius (325 A.D.) classes both with the ἀντιλεγόμενα, himself apparently rejecting them, though admitting that "Nevertheless they are publicly used in most of the churches." Origen (250 A.D.) is the first to quote Jas. by name, and that not as authentic, but ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολῇ. Jerome writes as to Jas.: "It is asserted that this was published by some other person under his name, though as time went on, it by degrees obtained authority." Jude *per contra* has actual supporters in Clement of Alexandria (215 A.D.) and the Muratorian Canon, though there is not a trace of its existence in earlier times save in 2 Pet.

tences. Toward Jude, which makes no pretences to great antiquity and authority beyond this probably conjectural superscription, we may properly take such an attitude. Toward 2 Peter, alone of New Testament writings, the loudest and most persistent in its pretensions, while at the same time by far the weakest in the attestation and regard of both antiquity and modern times,[1] our attitude must needs be different. From the point of view of the historian, pseudonymous may be as useful as authentic writings for the light shed on their own real age; but the Christian can only mitigate the disrespect he feels for plagiarists and impostors by the reflection that the conscience of the second century had practically no recognition for these literary crimes, rampant as they then were in the Church.

Literature employed in Jude.

Jude, for its extent, is peculiarly rich in its use of literature, including the Pauline,[2] especially the Pastoral Epistles, which are probably expressly referred to in 17, 18 (cf. 1 Tim. 4:1; 2 Tim. 3:1, 2; 4:3), but instead of the Old Testament it largely relies on apocryphal apocalyptic writings. The *Assumptio Mosis* is employed in verse 9[3] and in 14, 15, *Enoch* 1:1 is expressly cited as an actual writing of "Enoch the seventh from Adam." Other material from the same source is borrowed without acknowledgment in verses 6, 8.

Date and object.

The date and place of origin of this letter is determinable only from the character of the heresy to resist which it was written, and which Clement of Alexandria identified with the libertine Gnosticism

[1] 2 Pet. has not the support even of Eusebius among the Fathers nor of Calvin himself among the Reformers.

[2] Cf. 10, 19 with 1 Cor. 2:14, 15; 20, 24 with Col. 1:22; 2:7; 24, 25 with Rom. 16:25–27.

[3] Origen, *De Princip.* 3:2.

of Carpocrates (120–140 A.D.). In reality not mere antinomian laxity of morals is opposed (4, 8, 10, 12, 16, 18), but a definite system of pretended *gnosis* (vss. 8, 10, 19), inimical to respect for angels and for the authority of God and Christ (4, 8, 10, 18; cf. 1 Jn. 2:22; *Enoch* 48:10; Herm. *Sim.* 5:6, 1; Διδ. 4:1), and the heretics who, in the Pastoral Epistles, are still tolerated are here also part of the Church (vs. 12) and treated with lenity (22 f.), though already separating themselves[1] (19). But they are not yet "gone out from" the Christian body, as in 1 Jn. 2:19.

Gnostics opposed.

Accurate location in time and place of the special Gnostic sect here antagonised is impracticable. There is close relationship to the avaricious false teachers of the Pastoral Epistles (cf. *e.g.* 11 f., 16 with Tit. 1:11), but much closer still with the "Balaamites" of Rev. 2:14, 20, 24 and the "lawless" "false prophets" and "deniers of the Father and the Son" of 1 Jn. 2:18–23, 26; 3:4–12; 4:1–6 (cf. Jude 4, 8). In opposition, the writer urges that this apostasy was long since foretold (4, 14 f., 18), and commends to his readers the remedy of the Pastoral Epistles, the "deposit of the faith," and form of wholesome words delivered by the Apostles.[2]

Their character suggests "Asia" ca. 90 A.D.

But the mythologising and ascetic features of the Jewish theosophists have here receded behind the immorality of the "concision," contemptuous of angelic authorities. Asceticism and libertinism are, in fact, the two foci about which the Gnostic sects revolve. In Rev. 2:14 disregard for the rules of morality and communion with demonic beings (1 Cor.

[1] The phraseology indicates the Gnostic discriminations of the "spiritual" (Gnostics) from the "psychic" (ordinary men).

[2] 3, 17, 20; cf. 1 Tim. 1:11, 18; 4:6, 11, 16; 6:3, 13 f., 20; 2 Tim. 1:13 f.; 2:2, 14; 3:14 f.; Tit. 1:9; 2:1.

6:12–20; 10:1–11:1) is named "the teaching of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel, to eat things sacrificed to idols and to commit fornication" (cf. 1 Cor. 10:7, 8; Num. 25:1 ff.), and distinguished from that of "the Nicolaitans," which church tradition reports to have been ascetic. In Jude 7, 11, 16 (cf. 1 Cor. 10:10), 18, the heretics plunge into the way of Cain, the error of Balaam, and the rebellion of Korah.[1] All this suggests that the epistle, notwithstanding the superscription, is intended for a definite Christian circle, probably in Asia Minor,[2] whither its companion, 2 Peter, the Pastoral Epistles, 1–3 John, and Revelations are all directed, at a period not far from 90 A.D.

2 Pet. dependent on Jude.

The genius of Spitta[3] has not availed in the minds of scholars to reverse the relation of dependence of 2 Peter on Jude. The former has an introductory chapter exhorting believers in general to progress in Christian virtue in order to make sure of salvation, and an introduction of its writer in the personality of

[1] An early Ophite (*i.e.* serpent worshipping) Gnostic sect was called Cainite because of its peculiar attitude toward the O. T. Material existence being a misfortune, Jehovah the demiurge was an evil being, the Serpent who revealed to Adam and Eve the way of apotheosis through knowledge of good and evil (*gnosis*) was the type of the Redeemer (Rev. 2:24; 12:9). Thus the good and evil of the O. T. were reversed. Cain was the first saint (cf. 1 Jn. 3:12), Korah the first martyr, Balaam the first true prophet, Judas, from whom they pretended to have a "Gospel of Judas," the only one of the Twelve who understood Jesus, etc.

[2] So Von Soden, *Handcomm.*, p. 186, who points out the incompatibility, yet maintains the possibility of Jude having been written between 80 and 90 by Jude the Lord's brother.

[3] *Der 2 Brief des Pt. u. d. Brief des Jd.*, 1885.

Simon Peter "giving diligence to call the truth to their remembrance after his decease" (c. 1). Its author thereupon launches into an elaboration of Jude's denunciation of the false teachers, following that epistle step by step and, in considerable measure, word for word (c. 2).[1] To this is appended, after reference to the "former epistle," a refutation of another class of "mockers who say, Where is the promise of his (Christ's) coming? for from the day that the fathers fell asleep all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." The answer is, that the delay is not due to slackness on God's part in fulfiling his promises, but to long suffering. His mercy reckons a thousand years as one day. The Pauline Epistles, on account of obscurity of style, have been misinterpreted, along with "the other Scriptures," by the errorists.

[1] That the dependence is on the part of 2 Pet. is manifest — apart from the absolute marks of very late date, such as the allusion to the Pauline Epistles as Scripture, 3 : 15 — from six considerations : (i) 2 Pet. absorbs all of Jude and adds to it. (ii) The connection in Jude is logical, simple, and direct ; 2 Pet. 2 : 1–3 : 3 wanders into supplementary digressions and elaborations (*e.g.* 2 : 5 after 2 : 4 = Jude 6 ; 2 : 7–9 after 2 : 6 = Jude 6 ; 2 : 15, 16 after 2 : 14 = Jude 11). (iii) The copy is sometimes unintelligible without comparison of the original. So 2 Pet. 2 : 4 (through omission of the reference to Gen. 6 : 2 f. in Jude 6), 12 (cf. Jude 10), 17 (cf. Jude 12, 13). (iv) The opponents in Jude are a definite, tangible class (16, 19), in 2 Pet. 2 : 1–3 something foreseen in the future, then, after the digression, 4–9, from 10 on, something present. (v) The omission between 2 : 17 and 18 removes the citation from *Enoch*, Jude 14, 15, as the reference to *Apoc. Mos.* is similarly expurgated in 2 : 11 ; but the material taken from *Enoch* by Jude *without acknowledgement* remains. (vi) The reference of Jude 17 to Apostolic forewarnings is expanded in 2 Pet. 3 : 2 to a reference to the threefold canonical authority of the second century, prophecy, commandment of the Lord, apostolic tradition ; but cf. 3 : 3 = Jude 18.

Object.

The chief purpose of the writer appears in the appended chapter and at the same time makes the late date unmistakable. He would stir up a remembrance of the words of the prophets and "the commandment of the Lord and Saviour through the Apostles," and counteract the misinterpretation of the Pauline Epistles, so that after the decease of Peter, predicted in Jn. 21:18 ff. (cf. 2 Pet. 1:13–15), and the rest of "the fathers," mockers[1] may not jeer at the failure of the expected *parousia* (2 Pet. 3:4; cf. Jn. 21:23; 1 Thess. 4:15–18).

Contrast with 1 Pet.

But while 1 Peter is referred to and employed, even claimed by the writer as his own, scholars of ancient and modern times have recognised the impossibility of both being by the same author;[2] nor is there, in spite of the ostensible identity of the readers (3:1; but contrast 1:1), the slightest resemblance of circumstances. Persecution has suddenly passed away; heresy as suddenly appeared. Diversity of style might be accounted for, indeed, if Silvanus be real author of 1 Peter, but not the complete diversity of spirit and of circumstances; and we should then be unable to explain why in the one case the nominal writer subordinates his personality and in the other obtrudes it.

We may explain away, with Salmon,[3] the indications Edwin Abbott[4] has found of the author's acquaintance with Josephus (90 A.D.); or, if it really be considered more probable, assume, with Far-

[1] If these are the same who pervert the Pauline Epistles (3:16) we may compare Hymenæus and Philetus, 2 Tim. 2:18.

[2] Jerome endeavoured to account for the palpable difference of style by suggesting a twofold translation, from Greek to Hebrew and thence back to Greek!

[3] *Introd.* (1885), pp. 638–653.

[4] *Expositor*, 1882, Vol. III.

rar,[1] that Josephus borrowed from 2 Peter (!); still the dependence on New Testament literature from the Synoptists (2 Pet. 1:17 f.) to the Gospel of John (1:14); from the Pauline Epistles, which already form a definite Canon classed with "the other Scriptures," subject to the study of the devout, as well as to perversion by teachers of error, to 1 Peter and Jude, will carry us down irresistibly toward the middle of the second century. Here among the mass of pseudo-Petrine writings is one, at least, with which our epistle shows literary connection.[2]

Late and pseudonymous character.

The connection of the denunciation of Jude (c. 2) with the author's own polemic (c. 3) is probably due to the fact that the Gnostic false teachers are also the scoffers. Both objections and answers point to a late age. Both parties dispute about higher knowledge as a means of "participation in the divine nature" (1:3 f.), and appeal to Scripture of Old and New Testament (1:20 f.; 3:1 ff., 15 ff.). That a genuine writing of the Apostle Peter, plainly representing itself throughout as such (1:1, 14–16, 18; 3:1, 15), should leave not a trace of its existence throughout the second century, emerging at last to impress the scholars of the third and all succeeding centuries as the most out of character of all New Testament writings, is an extreme improbability. It can no more be met by romances imagining the Apostle to have kept his work in temporary concealment, than the internal evidence can be overcome by ignoring the author's dependence on late writings and explaining his anti-Gnostic zeal as prophetic foresight.

[1] *Expositor*, 1888, Vol. VIII.

[2] *The Apocalypse of Peter;* see A. Harnack, *Texte u. Unters.*, ix, 2, 1893, p. 90 f.

On the Catholic Epistles see Gloag's Introduction to *Cath. Epp.* and the arts. in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* (1899) and *Encyclopædia Biblica* (1899); also Sanday's *Bampton Lectures on Inspiration*, and other general works on *New Testament Introduction;* on James, Mayor (*ut supra*); on 1 Pet., *Commentaries* by Hort (1 : 1–2 : 17) 1898, and Johnstone (1888), and Jones's *Studies in 1 Peter* (1887); on the Johannine Epistles, Westcott, *The Epistles of St. John.* Bibliographies in the commentaries. For the teaching of the epistles see the volume by Gould, *Bib. Theol. of the N. T.* in this series.

PART IV

THE HISTORICAL BOOKS

CHAPTER VIII

THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION

Biblical history anonymous.

The historical books of the New Testament differ from its apocalyptic and epistolary literature as those of the Old Testament differ from its prophecy, in being invariably anonymous, and for the same reason. Prophecies, whether in the earlier or later sense, and letters, to have authority, must be referable to some individual; the greater his name the better. But history was regarded as a common possession. Its facts spoke for themselves. Only as the springs of common recollection began to dwindle, and marked differences to appear between the well-informed and accurate gospels and the untrustworthy, or when two or more of different content were read in the same church, did it become worth while for the Christian teacher or apologist to specify whether the given representation of the current tradition was "according to" this or that special compiler, and to state his qualifications. Previous to 175 A.D., accordingly, we have only citations from "the Gospel";[1] from 175 on, in growing number, references to "the Gospel according to" (κατά) this or that evangelist, and this or that

[1] Such was the title of Marcion's composition.

community (κατὰ τοὺς Ἑβραίους, κατὰ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους κτλ.).[1]

The Fourth Gospel stands alone.

The term "historical," as here used, does not of course exclude the express (Jn. 20:31) or implied purpose of the writers to utilise the material at command in the supreme interest of edification nor prejudge the question of credibility. Even the Fourth Gospel, aiming, as its beginning and close (1:1–18; 20:26–31) expressly teach, simply to interpret a doctrine as to the person and work of Christ by selections from the tradition of his life and teaching, might be held to belong among the "historical books"; for it employs their form of narrative, and is drawn, at however late a period and through however divergent a channel, from the common stream of Church tradition. But the history of the Fourth Gospel in the second century no less than its internal characteristics, and the practice of critics for one hundred years, compels us to make a broad distinction between it and the three whose singular interconnection, as we have seen, justly entitles them to the name "Synoptic." For if we represent by one hundred the entire contents of all four, the following table[2] will exhibit the relation: —

	Peculiarities	Coincidences
Mark	7	93
Matthew	42	58
Luke	59	41
John	92	8

[1] Salmon correctly points out that in some cases at least the preposition implies authorship, and not a mere indirect responsibility; otherwise our "Gospel according to Mark" would certainly have been designated "according to Peter"; for Justin Martyr already speaks of it as the Memorabilia of Peter (*Dial.* 106). On the other hand, such titles as "Gospel according to the Twelve Apostles," and the like, plainly imply that it was also used in the wider sense.

[2] See Westcott's *Introd. to the Gospels*, p. 191.

Setting apart, therefore, for later consideration, this almost wholly disconnected Gospel of John,[1] there remains for solution the problem of mingled peculiarities and coincidences in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, or the so-called Synoptic problem, and the related problem of the Book of Acts.

Interrelation of Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

Glance at the page of a Synopticon, such as W. G. Rushbrooke's (1880) or A. Wright's (1896), where the coincident parts of Matthew, Mark, and Luke are shown in parallel columns, or otherwise, or take an ordinary Gospel Harmony in Greek or English.[2] A very few moments will show why the problem exists, and will help to show why the successive attempts, already referred to,[3] to explain it by theories of oral tradition, of a primitive gospel, of utilisation by one another, are all found inadequate. Even the two-document theory, provisionally adopted in one form or other by nearly all modern scholars, lacks much of meeting all the requirements of the case.

Coincident material. Narrative.

The first division of Wright's Synopsis includes the general outline of Jesus' career, from baptism to resurrection, as given in Mark, this gospel being given entire in its order, and covering forty-nine columns quarto. On the left hand appears the coincident material of Matthew, paralleling Mark from beginning to end, omitting barely one or two brief incidents, but rearranging the order in the earlier part. On the right is the coincident material of

[1] The ancient Church also recognised the difference, sometimes grouping the Johannine writings by themselves apart from the Synoptic Gospels. So Tertullian repeatedly speaks of the "instrumentum Johannis."

[2] Robinson and Gardiner's *Greek Harmonies of the Gospels* will soon be superseded by that of Sanday and Allen in the *International Commentary* series. Stevens and Burton's *English Harmony* will serve for ordinary purposes of comparison.

[3] See pp. 7 and 17–20

Luke, also reproducing the whole of Mark, though with the considerable omission of Mk. 6:45–8:26,[1] besides a few minor passages, but with no change of order. On whichever side the dependence lies, this relation of Mark to Matthew and Luke is inexplicable without literary connection; for neither direct knowledge of the facts on the part of the writers themselves, nor oral tradition, can account for the selection of the same material,[2] nor the relation of it in substantially the same order, and, to a very large extent, in the very same words. For the coincidence is not only in the material or substance, but in the form — as when in the story of the healing of the paralytic[3] the curious parenthesis "then saith he to the sick of the palsy" is exactly reproduced — and in the language, which for whole sentences is word for word the same, particularly in the words of Christ. And this verbal coincidence extends to rare forms and expressions of the Greek, as *ἀπαρθῇ*, Matt. 9:15 = Mk. 2:20 = Lk. 5:35; *γεύσεσθαι θανάτου*, Matt. 16:28 = Mk. 9:1 = Lk. 9:27; *ζημιοῦσθαι*, Matt. 16:26 = Mk. 8:36 = Lk. 9:25; *ἀπεκρίνατο*, Matt. 27:12 = Mk. 14:61 = Lk. 23:9 (elsewhere always *ἀπεκρίθη*); *δυσκόλως*, nowhere but Matt. 19:23 = Mk. 10:23 = Lk. 18:24. Even if with some we could imagine the Twelve settling, by common consent, upon a given selection, form, and order of events in the narrative they would relate of Jesus' life and teaching, and

[1] On the reason for this omission, see Chapter IX.

[2] First of all "the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done" in Matt. 11:20 ff. is Chorazin. But none of the evangelists steps from the beaten track so much as to mention one of these miracles. Almost the same can be said of Bethsaida, which comes next in order. Mk. 8:22 ff. is the sole instance, and is omitted in both Matt. and Lk. For the special additions of Lk., and the order, see below.

[3] Matt. 9:6 = Mk. 2:10 = Lk. 5:24.

as committing to memory the *ipsissima verba* of this mechanical scheme, we should still have only an agreement in Aramaic, and nothing to account for coincidences in the Greek.[1]

The question, therefore, now reduces itself to the form: Have our Synoptists borrowed from one another for their narrative of Jesus' career, or do they depend in common on some older source?

Discourse material common to Matthew and Luke.

Passing to Wright's second division of the material, consisting wholly of discourses of considerable length, we find it to include some twenty-eight columns of material from Matthew, six-sevenths of which is paralleled in Luke. But one-third of this, or two-sevenths of the material of Matthew, shows a relatively close verbal identity.[2] Mark has only here and there a touch betraying acquaintance with this mass of discourse material.

Here again the oral tradition theory is helpless, for how could the story of the Baptist's message and Jesus' reply be orally transmitted in but two versions,[3] and these two even in Greek almost word for word the same? And why is the case so entirely different with the Eschatological Discourse? But a

[1] Wetzel (*Synopt. Evang.*,[2] p. 143 f.) seems indeed to assume that such a recitation "as to-day in a public school" was actually carried on *in Greek* by Matthew, as special delegate of the Twelve, for the benefit of the Hellenistic Jews. But were the rest meantime debarred from teaching in Aramaic? The whole representation, pp. 142–146, is most instructive as an illustration of the absurdities involved in the attempt to form a historical conception of the beginnings of an *Erzählungstypus*.

[2] *E.g.* Lk. 3 : 7–9, 17 = Matt. 3 : 7–10, 12; Lk. 4 : 2*b*–13 = Matt. 4 : 2–11*a*; Lk. 12 : 22–31 = Matt. 6 : 25–34; Lk. 7 : 18–28, 31–35 = Matt. 11 : 2–11, 16–19, the other two-thirds being much more widely divergent, *e.g.* Lk. 6 : 20*b*–23 = Matt. 5 : 3–12; Lk. 14 : 15–24 = Matt. 22 : 1–14; Lk. 15 : 3–7 = Matt. 18 : 12–14.

[3] Matt. 11 : 2–19 = Lk. 7 : 18–35.

theory of direct literary dependence throughout the two gospels is equally helpless. Our Matthew, if borrowing from Luke, would not have omitted the parable of the Prodigal Son,[1] nor the miracle of Nain.[2] Conversely, the use of Matthew by Luke, supported as it is by some admirable scholars,[3] is incredible. Gentile indifference on the part of the evangelist himself and his readers to the differentiation of the new righteousness from that of scribe and Pharisee might explain the omission of Matt. 5:17–43; 6:1–18; 11:28–30(?); 21:28–32(?); 23:15–22 in Lk.; more easily still in his predecessors[4]; but (1) neither this nor any other motive attributable to our Matthew can account for the omission of 13:24–30, 36–52; 18:23–35; 20:1–16; 25:1–13, 31–46. (2) It is incredible that Luke should have left the beginning and end of his gospel (cc. 1–3, 24; cf. Mt. cc. 1, 2, 28) in such flagrant contradiction with that he so largely depended on, especially if it was believed to emanate from the pen of an Apostle.[5] (3) It would be impossible to explain why two-thirds of the material, not differing as to content in any definable way from the rest, should be entirely recast, while the remaining one-third should be taken over almost verbatim.

Explained neither by oral tradition nor direct dependence.

The common discourse material of Matthew and

[1] Lk. 15:11–32. [2] Lk. 7:11–17.

[3] Even Holtzmann yields to the seductive pages of Simon (*Hat der dritte Evang't d. can. Mt. benutzt?* 1880) so far as to admit that Lk. is affected by *reminiscences* of Matt.

[4] Wright, *op. cit.* p. viii, suggests that in process of conveyance to Lk., from Palestinian to Gentile regions, the Jewish features of the tradition were dropped.

[5] This objection does not apply to employment by Lk. of an *earlier form* of Matt., which had not as yet these peculiar features. But this theory we purposely leave open to further consideration.

Luke, accordingly, requires the assumption of at least one underlying written source. The third of the above considerations suggests two if not more.

Peculiar material.

Turning now from the material common to all three, or to two only, of the Synoptists to that which is peculiar to each, and discriminating as before between discourse and narrative, we observe that Mark has practically no peculiar material of either kind.[1] But what could be more absurd than an evangelist who attempts to improve upon a gospel already current by simply extracting a part of its contents, and that part the smaller and less authoritative, and touching it up with a few unimportant embellishments and additions! Could he imagine that his readers would prefer plagiarising extracts to the rich source from which he drew?[2] If his source was Matthew, either he would not have written at all, or he would have reëdited the larger work; most of all, if it was then regarded as the work of an Apostle. If his source was Luke, what amazing method guided him in the selection of his material? The omissions would be

[1] The Demoniac of Capernaum, 1 : 23–28 = Lk. 4 : 33–37, fails to appear in Matt. ; but to balance accounts the Demoniac of Gerasa, 5 : 1–20, who utters the same remarkable confession, is made *duplicate* in Matt. 8 : 28–34. So of the Dumb man, Mk. 7 : 31–37, and the Blind man of Bethsaida, Mk. 8 : 22–26, omitted by both Matt. and Lk. To balance accounts, the healing of Matt. 12 : 22, which has an identical effect on the multitude, includes both blindness and dumbness, though in the parallels of 9 : 32 and Lk. 11 : 14 it is dumbness only ; the connected blind man of 9 : 27–31 is not only duplicated, but his counterpart, 20 : 29–34 = Mk. 10 : 46–52 = Lk. 18 : 35–43 as well. The omission of Mk. 4 : 26–29 by Matt. and Lk. is probably due to its close resemblance to vss. 30–32 ; that of Mk. 12 : 41–44 (= Lk. 21 : 1–4) by Matt. is unexplained. On Lk.'s omission of Mk. 6 : 45–7 : 26, see Chapter IX.

[2] Comprehensiveness was principally sought. See the Papias fragment οὐ γαρ τοῖς τὰ πὸλλὰ λέγουσιν ἔχαιρον ὥσπερ οἱ πολλοί.

Matthew wholly, Luke partly, dependent on Mark's narrative material.

either way incredible. Not so if we reverse the case. Both Matthew and Luke have enough of their own to add to Mark to make the recast well worth while. The difference is this: Matthew has an exceptionally rich store of discourse material, partly shared by Luke, to add, and practically nothing else pertaining to Jesus' public career.[1] Luke has a strongly marked mass of material, including both narrative and discourse, in rich profusion and of the highest importance, entirely peculiar to himself and demonstrably extending far on into his second treatise. We need mention only in the way of narrative: The Infancy,[2] The Widow of Nain,[3] The Anointing of the Lord's Feet,[4] Mary and Martha,[5] The Crooked Woman,[6] The Ten Lepers,[7] Zacchæus,[8] Pilate and Herod,[9] The Penitent Thief,[10] The Journey to Emmaus;[11] in the way of discourse: the parables of The Good Samaritan,[12] The Rich Fool,[13] The Prodigal Son,[14] The Unjust Steward,[15]

[1] Significant in character are the narrative additions of Matt. They consist of the following: (*a*) cc. 1, 2 the genealogy and infancy of Jesus fulfilling prophecies of Messiah. (*b*) Certain additions of an apocryphal character in the story of the Passion and Resurrection: the Suicide of Judas, 27 : 3–8; Pilate's Wife's Dream, 27 : 19, and his Washing his Hands, vss. 24, 25; the Earthquake and Opening of the Tombs, vss. 51*b*–53; the Setting and Bribing of the Roman Watch, vss. 62–66; 28 : 11–15. (*c*) A brief close in general terms to fit the fragmentary ending of Mk., Matt. 28 : 16–20 (28 : 9, 10 is a doublet of vss. 7, 8). (*d*) Two stories seemingly gathered from floating legend: Peter's Walking on the Water, 14 : 28–31, and the Coin in the Fish's Mouth, 17 : 24–27. In the account of Jesus' public career the only narrative additions to Mk., aside from mere duplications and editorial generalities, are the two under (*d*), the Centurion's Servant, 8 : 5–13 = Lk. 7 : 2–10 = Jn. 4 : 46–54; and the Rejection of Two Volunteer Disciples, 8 : 18–22 = Lk. 9 : 57–60. See below.

[2] cc. 1–3. [3] 7 : 11–17. [4] 7 : 36–50. [5] 10 : 38–42. [6] 13 : 10–17. [7] 17 : 11–19. [8] 19 : 1–10. [9] 23 : 4–19. [10] 23 : 39–43. [11] 24 : 13–35. [12] 10 : 25–37. [13] 12 : 13–21. [14] 15 : 11–32. [15] 16 : 1–12.

The Rich Man and Lazarus,[1] The Unjust Judge,[2] The Pharisee and Publican,[3] and discourses on special occasions, such as 4:16–30; 9:51–56; 13:1–5, etc.[4]

Logical analysis of the synoptic writings. 1. Mark.

A synopsis of the contents of these three related gospels in the form given them by the ultimate editor will aid us in perceiving the relation. The chronological order is doubtless Mark, Matthew, Luke, though there is no direct interrelation between Matthew and Luke, and *the discourse nucleus* of Matthew is doubtless older than Mark.

Mark has the following scheme: —

i. **Preliminaries** (ἀρχὴ τ. εὐαγγ.). **The Baptism of John and Jesus' Call,** 1:1–13.

ii. **The Galilean Ministry,** 1:14–8:26.

(*a*) Jesus' preaching and healing and its effects; popularity and opposition, 1:14–3:12.

(*b*) The training and mission of the Twelve to preach and heal. The parables. The mighty works, 3:13–35; 4:1–34; 4:35–6:13.

iii. **The Crisis in Galilee,** 6:14–8:26.

(*a*) Episode of Herod and John. Jesus' amazing miracles, 6:14–29, 30–56.

(*b*) He defies the Pharisees and goes into exile, 7:1–23.

(*c*) [Largely duplicate.] Incidents connected with the period of exile, 7:24–8:26.

iv. **The Journey to the Passover and Jerusalem Ministry,** 8:27–13:37.

(*a*) Revelation of the nature of Jesus' calling, 8:27–9:13.

(*b*) Incidents of the journey through Galilee and Peræa, 9:14–10:52.

[1] 16:19–31. [2] 18:1–8. [3] 18:9–14.

[4] For a discussion of the special source of Lk., see Chapter IX.

(*c*) The appeal to Israel at the Passover, cc. 11, 12.
(*d*) The prediction of the end, c. 13.
v. **The Passion and Resurrection**, cc. 14–16.

2. Matthew. The scheme of Matthew modifies the above only in § ii and by constant additions, almost solely of discourse material, as follows: —

i. **Preliminary Story**, 1:1–4:17.
(*a*) Birth and childhood of Jesus, cc. 1, 2.
(*b*) Ministry of John, baptism and call of Jesus, 3:1–4:17.
ii. **The Galilean Ministry**, 4:18–9:35.
(*a*) The preaching, 4:18–7:29.
(*b*) The mighty works, 8:1–9:35.
(*c*) The mission of the Twelve, 9:36–10:42.
(*d*) Effects: (1) Acceptance by the few and lowly; (2) opposition by the Pharisees; (3) Jesus teaches in parables, cc. 11, 12, 13.
iii. **The Crisis and Rejection in Galilee. Jesus founds his Church**, 14:1–16:12; 16:13–18:35.
iv. **The Ministry in Peræa and Jerusalem**, cc. 19–25.
v. **The Passion and Resurrection**, cc. 26–28.

3. Luke. The scheme of the third Gospel follows the order of Mark without transposition, but omits iii (*c*) and intercalates two masses of mingled narrative and discourse in ii (*b*) and iv (*b*) with the following result: —

i. **Preliminary Story**, cc. 1–3.
(*a*) Preface, 1:1–4.
(*b*) Birth and childhood of John and Jesus, 1:5–2:52.
(*c*) Ministry of John. Baptism and call of Jesus. His pedigree, 3:1–20, 21 f., 23–28.
ii. **The Ministry of the First Period**, 4:1–9:50.[1]

[1] In many ways the geographical limits of this period (§ 2 in Mk.) are obliterated in Lk. By transposing 4:9–13 (cf.

(*a*) Beginning of Jesus' work. Temptation in Judæa. Preaching and opposition in Galilee. Call of Peter and others, 4:1–6:10.

(*b*) Choosing and instruction of the Twelve, 6:12–49.

(*c*) The witness of Jesus' works appeals to the lowly and to John, 7:1–8:3.

(*d*) The rest of Mark's account of the Galilean ministry and crisis, including Peter's confession and the connected story, but omitting 3 (*c*) (incidents of the Exile period), 8:4–9:50.

iii. **The Ministry of the Second (Peræan) Period,** 9:51–18:30.

(*a*) A heterogeneous group of incidents and discourses ending with an eschatology, 9:51–13:35.

(*b*) A second group, principally of discourses exalting the lowly, with second eschatological discourse, 14:1–18:14.

(*c*) The rest of Mark's material up to the final journey to Jericho and Jerusalem, 18:15–30.

iv. **The Ministry of the Final Passover, with Third Eschatology,** 18:31–21:38.

v. **The Passion and Resurrection,** cc. 22–24.

This evangelist's second treatise has the following scheme:— 4. Acts.

i. Founding of the Church in Judæa, Samaria, and Syria, and First Attempts to convert the Gentiles. The Career of Peter, cc. 1–14.

(*a*) Peter and the Apostolic body in Jerusalem. Vain opposition of the authorities, and resulting

Matt.), and inserting "Judæa" in 4:44; 5:17; 6:17, the field is widened to all Palestine, — a step toward the Johannine view, — and the Temptation, 4:1–14, and incident of Cæsarea Philippi — though not the locality — included.

spread of the Gospel, and conversion of the arch-persecutor, cc. 1, 2, 3–5; 6:1–9:31.

(*b*) Peter inaugurates and justifies the conversion of the Gentiles. Antioch a second centre of Christianity. Final establishment of the mother church, 9:32–11:18; 11:19–30; c. 12.

(*c*) First missionary journey. Paul and Barnabas extend the Gospel from Antioch to Cyprus, Cilicia, and Galatia, cc. 13, 14.

ii. **Spread of the Gospel in the Græco-Roman world. Career of Paul,** cc. 15–28.

(*a*) The basis of Gentile recognition determined by the Apostles, 15:1–35.

(*b*) Paul and Silas evangelise Greece and Proconsular Asia (second and third missionary journeys), 15:36–19:20.

(*c*) Paul goes with the delegates of the Greek churches to Jerusalem. His arrest and defences, 19:21–21:26; 21:27–26:32.

(*d*) Paul's journey to Rome and planting (establishment) of the Gospel there, cc. 27, 28.

Inferences from content as to sources and interrelation.

Returning to the sources of this historical material, it appears that the narrative material of Matthew is simply that of Mark transferred to form a framework for the masses of discourse. Of the 103 narratives enumerated by Wright as the content of Mark, Matthew contains all but five of the briefest, and has more or less distinct parallels to three of these;[1] *and*

[1] The other two are Mk. 9:38 f. and 12:41–44, probably additions to Mk. later than Matt., but earlier than Lk., for Mk. 9:38 f. interrupts the connection of 37 with 40 (42?) ff. (cf. Mt. 18:1–6), and 12:41–44 has no relation to what follows, and only indirect relation to what precedes — the hypocrisy of the scribes, "who for a pretence make long prayers, but devour widows' houses." For the three duplicated incidents, see above, p. 181 note[1].

of narrative material he has practically nothing else, the infancy chapters and the trifling additions in 14:28–31, 17:24–27, and c. 27 f. merely emphasising, by their peculiar character, the evangelist's poverty in this particular. So exact a coincidence is inexplicable without a knowledge of Mark itself in substantially its present form; and it being insupposable that the author of Mark should have composed his work by merely subtracting the narrative element of Matthew, we find here positive proof of dependence by our Matthew on our Mark.[1] Equally certain is the dependence of Luke. We have not, indeed, the same coincidence of narrative material here, but, as above shown, large masses from an unknown source, and *per contra* omissions of Marcan material which have suggested theories of a briefer proto-Mark; but what the demonstration loses in cogency on this score is made up by the carefulness of Luke to preserve the original sequence of the narrative.[2] Nor can the

Matthew and Luke severally use our Mark.

[1] It is important to observe that the proof rests by no means on the general phenomena above cited alone. On the contrary, the literary dependence of Matt. on Mk. can be proved in detail, paragraph by paragraph, as *e.g.* 13:10–23, where the parenthesis of Mk. 4:10–25, inserted by a trait characteristic of this author, is obliterated, while substitution is made in vss. 34–36. A still more remarkable example occurs in the following chapter, where, the closing bracket of the parenthesis of Mk. 6:14–29 being obliterated through misunderstanding, the story which in 14:1 ff. begins as a matter of the past winds up in vs. 12 as a matter of the present.

It should also be observed that the use of our Mk. in substantially its present form by no means precludes independent, perhaps previous, employment of the sources from which Mk. is drawn.

[2] Once the dependence of Matt. on our Mk. is proved, attempts to account for the relation between Mk. and Lk. in some other way (proto-Mark theories, etc.) become *a priori* improbable.

omissions of Luke be due to their absence from the Mark he follows, for the contemporary or earlier Matthew stands witness of their presence.

Previous results confirmed.

Our survey of the material content of the Synoptic Gospels in search of an explanation of their origin has thus reduced to a minimum of applicability the once cherished theory of oral tradition.[1] That of a proto-gospel, from which each evangelist has drawn his share of both narrative and discourse material, is equally insupposable. We should not know at which to marvel most: the disappearance of so supremely precious a record; the folly of our evangelists in omitting each some of the choicest material, whether from their point of view or ours; or the folly of the Church in accepting the meagre substitute for the whole.[2] The current "two document" theory — our Mark and the *Logia* as the principal sources of Matthew and Luke — may, therefore, be considered permanently established as giving in outline the ultimate solution. But no more than "in outline." Some theory of one or more underlying collections of discourses is indispensable to explain the relation of Matthew to Luke; and at least one extensive work, containing independent masses of discourse and narrative together, underlies the whole work of Luke.

[1] The few able advocates it still retains are mainly English scholars, notably Westcott (*op. cit.*) and Wright (*op. cit.*, and *The Composition of the Four Gospels*, 1890).

[2] See the able attempt of Edwin Abbott, *Enc. Brit.*, art. "Gospels," and Abbott and Rushbrooke, *The Common Tradition of the Syn. Gos.*, to reach an original "triple tradition" by elimination of all not common to the three Synoptists. The further the process is carried the greater the resemblance of the resultant "original written gospel" to our Mk. Says Dods (*Introd.*, p. 13), "The approximation of Mk. to the original written gospel is one of the most generally accepted findings of modern criticism."

Finally, the relation of Matthew and Luke to Mark is inexplicable, save by a theory of mutually independent employment of this proto-gospel or gospels.

From order of events.

These conclusions will only be strengthened by an examination of the second striking phenomenon of the Synoptic tradition, viz. its order of events. Of the hopeless confusion which reigned on this score, we have not only the eloquent witness of the gospels themselves, with their chaos of sequences, but the implicit testimony of the author of Luke, and the explicit statement of our oldest external authority. The words of Papias, reporting his ancient authority, are all the more weighty that he himself does his utmost to minimise their effect; for practically all he reports bears upon this one point — the inaccuracy of Mark's order, which was due to his not having been himself a follower of the Lord, but, later, of Peter, and Peter's discourses not having been given as a connected narrative.[1] As we shall see, this testimony is strictly in accord with the phenomena of the gospel itself. The outline of Mark is the very spinal column of the entire Gospel tradition; but in Mark both discourses and incidents are grouped almost invariably on a subjective or topical, not a chronological plan.[2] And yet Luke, specially desirous as he is of

Mark's order topical.

[1] Discussions of the standard by which Mk.'s inaccuracy of order was measured are beside the mark, for Papias is reporting a tradition old enough to go back to "the living and abiding voice."

[2] Thus the incident 1:40–45 winds up the account of Jesus' growing and burdensome popularity, but obviously is taken by prolepsis from a much later time, for in what follows Jesus is still teaching in cities and synagogues, 2 : 1 ; 3 : 1 ; 6 : 1–6. The section 2 : 1–3 : 6 again extends in both directions beyond the apparent limits, grouping together a series of conflicts, of which the last (3 : 6) would make further teaching, such as is described in 6 : 6, impossible. The series of teachings, 4 : 1–34, followed by that of mighty works, 4 : 35–6 : 6, simply illus-

remedying this defect of the tradition, carefully "tracing up all things from the very first that he may set them down in (chronological) order," clings to this order of Mark as the one Ariadne thread of the labyrinth; while even Matthew never ventures to depart from it from the point where he ceases his general description of Jesus' teaching and mighty works, and the unfavourable reception accorded them in Galilee, cc. 4–13. Even here, the order is manifestly not historical, but literary, in fact, it is the same general scheme as in the section of Mark referred to in our note, 3:7–6:13, only much more mechanically carried out; (*a*) the teaching (cc. 5–7), addressed to a vast multitude, though as yet Jesus' fame has had no opportunity to spread,[1] and arranged upon a stereotyped, numerical plan; (*b*) a chain of ten miracles (cc. 8, 9), so selected that each class is illustrated by one example.[2] After this, (*c*) the mission of the

But followed by Matthew and Luke.

trates the training of the Twelve, whose appointment for this purpose (3:14, 15) is related in 3:7–35. But neither did the incident of "the scribes who came down from Jerusalem." with the associated intervention of Jesus' mother and brethren, 3:20–35, occur at this time (cf. 7:1 ff. and Lk. 11:14–54 = Matt. 12:22–50; 15:1–20, and see B. Weiss, *Mkev.*, 1872, p. 127 note); nor can the subsequent series of mighty works have all followed in chronological order.

[1] By carrying back the introductory description, 4:23–25 = Mk. 3:7–12, from its proper position after Mk. 1:14–45; 2:1–3:6, Matt. has deprived it of all proper sense. It has no explanation in what precedes, for Jesus has done nothing to excite such extraordinary fame; nor does it agree with what follows, for the true Sermon on the Mount (nucleus of cc. 5–7) was delivered not to the mixed multitude, but to the disciples. But note that when cc. 5–7 are removed, with their Marcan setting (Matt. 4:18–25; 8:1–4), we obtain in 4:12–17; 8:5–10 a connection not only natural in itself but in agreement with Jn. 4:46 ff. (2:12).

[2] Thus the "mighty deeds," for unbelief in which, in c. 11, the people are upbraided, while John in prison and the humble

twelve disciples, whose selection, however, the evangelist has omitted to mention, to preach and heal in like manner (c. 10). This is followed (*d*) by Jesus' commendation of the Baptist and rebuke of unbelieving Israel, above mentioned (c. 11), and (*e*) his adoption, after a series of conflicts with the scribes and Pharisees (c. 12), of the method of parables to instruct the multitude (c. 13).

Variations explicable.

While there are subordinate groups here, which have no relation to the general scheme (*e.g.* 8:1–4, 5–13, 14–17, followed by 18–22), it is clear that the plan is literary, not historical.[1] Yet this arbitrary scheme is all that the Synoptic Gospels afford of divergence from the order of Mark, save for the occasional timid attempts of Luke to correct palpable dislocations, sometimes making confusion worse confounded.[2]

Inferences. 1. No Apostolic protogospel.

Oral tradition, in the sense of such preaching as Papias describes, undoubtedly accounts for the Church's condition of helpless confusion as to the sequence of events in the life of Jesus, after the death

"babes" are encouraged, are each exhibited in turn — "the blind see (9:27 f.), the lame walk (8:5 f.; 9:1 f.), the lepers are cleansed (8:1 ff.), the deaf hear (9:32 f.), the dead are raised up (9:18 f., 23 f.), and the poor have glad tidings preached unto them (9:35)."

[1] Cf. *e.g.* 8:1, "great multitudes" with 8:4*a*, "tell no man"; and 8:14, which, as we see from Mk. 1:14–34, should follow Matt. 4:22.

[2] As an example of correction, cf. Lk. 3:19 with Mk. 6:14–29, and contrast the ὕστερον πρότερον of Matt. 11:2; 14:3. For confusion cf. Lk. 4:16–30 with Mk. 6:1–6; but see vss. 23 and 31 ff. Observe also Lk. 5:1–11 following 4:31–44 = Mk. 1:21–49. In substituting the narrative of the call of "Peter and those with him" for the call of the four, Mk. 1:16–20, Lk. failed to observe that in Mk. the relation established in 1:16–20 explains those of vss. 29 ff., so that the Simon of Lk. 4:38, whose house Jesus enters and whose wife's mother he heals, became a wholly unknown character.

of the principal witnesses, and accounts for it rightly and naturally. But only upon the assumption that no Apostolic proto-gospel or authoritative *biography* was in existence. Doubtless, at first only the testimony of the Lord himself was deemed worthy of written record, forming collections of aphorisms and memorable sayings after the plan of the *Pirke Aboth*[1] or the Oxyrhynchus fragment improperly called the *Logia*, while the varying groups of narratives, which would form the testimony of Apostles and other witnesses to his wonderful works, deeds of wisdom and mercy, death and resurrection, went through a much longer process of sifting, combination, and editing before attaining a quasi-authoritative form and content, such as now appears in the Synoptic material. Until the strictly Apostolic witnesses began to disappear, this material would be largely unwritten, and altogether too free and copious for codification. Men would rely on the memory of the preacher, or even, as in Acts 10:37 ff., on general information and report, for the thread of narrative needful to explain and bind together the pearls of *logia*, which taught the Way of Life. The greater difficulty and consequent delay in reducing this mass (cf. Lk. 1:1; Jn. 21:25) explains, in a manner as completely natural as it is harmonious with the primeval tradition, the almost servile dependence of both our chief authorities for their order on the sequence of Mark, the reported "interpreter" of Peter. Imperfect and subjective as it was admitted to be, it was the nearest approach to a written standard; so that our "Matthew" and "Luke" vary from it only in a few instances, mostly such as show their conjectural

2. The tradition verified: first attempts *logia*; Mark the first narrative of note.

[1] The oldest tractate of the Talmud, a collection of aphoristic sayings handed down by tradition mostly from pre-Christian Jewish Fathers.

character upon their face. The tradition reported by Papias is therefore exactly in accord with the phenomena, including others not here mentioned, such as the striking coincidence of language where the words of Jesus are given, tending to disappear as soon as the narrative framework is reached.[1] Whether the Fourth Gospel, if known as Apostolic, would have furnished the sought-for standard, is a question by itself. But it is not a supposable case that our Matthew, or any similar *biographical* gospel comprising both sayings and doings, widely known and acknowledged as from the hand of an Apostle, afforded the desired authoritative standard of order, yet was unknown to, or disregarded by, both Mark and Luke. We scarcely need the host of evidences proving the Greek origin of our Matthew; its dependence on our Mark and the sources thereof, its composite character, exhibiting as it does no less than twenty-two instances of the same incident or saying twice told in slightly different forms,[2] with others similar, in view of this culminating fact. The primeval and widespread tradition of the Church needs not correction, but restatement. It maintained, we should remember, that the work of the Apostle Matthew had been a compilation, in Papias's day no longer extant, of "the sayings of the Lord," in express distinction from such narratives as Mark and Luke, the former of whom undertook, with however scanty qualification for "giving a connected account of the Lord's sayings,"[3] to "write down accurately everything that he

[1] Cf. *e.g.* Mk. 10 : 32–34 with Matt. 20 : 17–19 ; Lk. 18 : 31–34 in the respective parts.

[2] *E.g.* Matt. 9 : 27–31 = 20 : 29–34, or 12 : 38, 39 = 16 : 1, 2.

[3] The Lord's teaching was always the object in view, whether in the report of the word itself or the accompanying explanatory narrative.

remembered . . . whether things said or things done" of the narrations of Peter. The latter, Luke, himself informs us (Acts 1:1) that his earlier work was intended as a narrative of Jesus' earthly career complete, "both doings and teachings," and that the question of the "order" had been a matter of special care (Lk. 1:3).

Results of criticism.

Independently the critic arrives at the following explanation of the literary phenomena: (1) A compilation of *Logia* by the Apostle Matthew, early current in many forms, and (2) the biography of Mark constitute the foundation of the Gospel tradition of later times and two of the most important sources of Luke. In its slow, but more and more confident and universal adoption of this two-document theory, as its fundamental position on the Synoptic problem, the criticism of to-day may well be said to be going "back to tradition." We shall see, however, that these two facts, while the most fundamental, are by no means sufficient to explain the complex history of the formation of the Synoptic tradition.[1]

[1] For statistics bearing on the problem, see Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*, 1899. Norton, *Genuineness of the Gospels*, and Westcott, *Introduction to the Four Gospels*, 1895, are among the best of the older special works in English. O. Cone, *Gospel Criticism and Hist. Christianity* is the best recent compendium. E. Abbott, Badham, Carpenter, and A. Wright have discussions in support of particular views. Wilkinson's *Four Lectures on the early History of the Gospels*, and Baring-Gould's *Lost and Hostile Gospels* have special features of value. Very recently (1899) J. Palmer discusses *The Gospel Problems and their Solution*. Articles of value on the "Synoptic Problem," by Sanday, may be found in Smith's *B. D.*, 2d ed., also in the *Expositor*, Series IV, Vol. III, and by H. H. Wendt in the *New World* for June, 1895. *Biblical Introduction*, 1900, O. T. by Bennett, N. T. by Adeney, should have been mentioned before among popular general works. The discussion of the Synoptic problem is excellent.

CHAPTER IX

THE SYNOPTIC WRITERS

As yet we have but touched the surface of the Synoptic problem; but we have reached common ground for tradition and criticism, disembarrassed of several untenable theories. From this standpoint, however, it is apparent that our gospels have already a long history behind them of compilation, accretion, readjustment of material from various sources, which makes even our present working theory quite too simple to account for all the phenomena. Indeed, we might have guessed at such a past from the fact that while the author of Lk. 1:1 was acquainted with many attempts to draw up a comprehensive narrative of the facts (*ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν τῶν πραγμάτων*), in one way or another, our three Synoptic Gospels have managed to take up all the material of any value, of which traces remained until the second century. As we might expect from the many variant forms of our first gospel, which early circulated in Palestine, from the internal evidence and testimony of tradition as to the extremely early origin of the more essential element of its content, and from the fact that to at least an important section of the Church and for a considerable time it continued to be "the Gospel" *par eminence*, the traces of a checkered career of editorial amplification, recasting, modification are more marked in Matthew than in any other. Only the process of translation of the *Logia* nucleus from the Aramaic

Literary vicissitudes of Matt.

(Hebrew ?), the one universally attested fact of early Church tradition, has left no traces. Nor can this be accidental. Not only would such traces be more incapable of eluding research than those of any other process, but by positive evidence, now universally admitted to be conclusive,[1] our Gospel, in all its parts, was originally a Greek gospel. "Since, then," says Professor Salmon, "our Greek gospel bears marks of not being a mere translation, we must choose between the hypotheses that we have in the Greek the gospel as written by Matthew himself, or the gospel as written by an unknown writer who used as his principal material an Aramaic writing by St. Matthew, which has now perished." In defiance of primitive tradition Salmon adopts the former alternative. With more reasonable conservatives, such as Westcott, Godet, Weiss, Zahn, and Dalman, we hold that the Apostle wrote his work in Aramaic, and only Aramaic,[2] and that the subsequent Greek edition, by

The Apostle's Aramaic work.

[1] Holtzmann, *Einl.*,[3] p. 377: "The Greek original of the first Gospel is now absolutely assured." Keim, *Life of Christ*, i, 77: "Hardly any one now believes that this Gospel was written in Hebrew. Dods, *Introd.* p. 18: "One of the ascertained conclusions of criticism." Most apologists assume two gospels by Matt., the later in Greek. See Gardiner, in *Journ. Bibl. Lit.*, 1890, p. 1 ff.). Besides the adoption of the whole mass of our *Greek* Mk., and coincidence in the *Greek* of the discourse material of Lk., we have as evidence the citations from the O. T., which conform usually to the LXX. even more closely than in Mk. in the body of the work. Only in the editorial supplements are there traces of acquaintance with the Hebrew, and even here, *e.g.* 1 : 23, the inferences drawn often depend entirely on the use of the LXX. It is needless to refer to plays upon words (Greek), explanations of Palestinian customs (27 : 15 ; 28 : 15 ; 22 : 23), etc.

[2] See the thorough discussion in Zahn, *Einl.*, Vol. II (1899), IX, § 54, also B. Weiss, *Introd.*, Vol. II, pp. 228 ff., Eng. tr., but especially Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, Bd. I, 1898.

an unknown hand, was a representative, rather than a translation of the original, probably supplemented by a considerable amount of narrative material. In other words, the process of translation has left no traces in our gospel because, strictly, the history of our gospel does not reach back so far. Yet, in consideration of what may be called its prehistoric period, we may venture to treat it first in order, without deciding for the present whether its first appearance as a complete biographical Greek gospel preceded or followed that of Mark.

Its character and date.

Every indication favours and nothing opposes the primitive tradition attributing the Aramaic compilation of *Logia* to the Apostle Matthew; the character of the writing, its language, its occasion (departure of authoritative teachers), the relative insignificance of the name,[1] the occupation of publican,[2] even the fact that but for the change here and in 10:3 from the form of Mk. 2:14; 3:18 we should not know that Matthew was the publican Levi, son of Alphæus. For this change may safely be attributed to that editor who embodied the contents of Mark. Doubtless we may also accept the statement that the Apostle put forth his work as he was about to leave Jerusalem;[3] for authorities agree as to this. Irenæus, by far the oldest and best authority, is followed by Eusebius in his *History* in making this "departure" the flight of the Church from Jerusalem just before the siege (66–67 A.D.). In his *Chronicle*, however, Eusebius dates the composition in 41 A.D., apparently

[1] As against Peter, John, James, to which a multitude of apocryphal writings attach themselves.

[2] Mt. 9:9.

[3] See the quotation from Irenæus above, p. 47, and cf. Euseb., *Hist.*, 3:5 and 24; also *Chronicon, ad an. ii. Gaii* = 41 A.D.

following a different tradition, which identified the "departure" with the traditional going forth of the Twelve from Jerusalem, according to a pretended commandment of Jesus,[1] "after twelve years" (*i.e.* from the crucifixion, generally dated by the Fathers in 29 A.D.). Both the weight of authority and the absence from the Pauline Epistles[2] of any trace of such a compilation favour the date of Irenæus (66 A.D.) as that of the foundation of gospel-writing in general, and of the growth of our gospel in particular.[3]

Its relation to our Matt.

Since the abandonment of the identity of our Matthew with the work referred to by Papias's informant, the efforts of conservative writers are naturally directed to the inclusion of as large a part as possible of the narrative element of this gospel. We need not recapitulate the difficulties already mentioned, which increase in force as we attempt to extend the *Logia* in this direction. To say nothing of the dependence on Mark, the very scheme of our Matthew is such as no Apostle could possibly have framed. What we may call the outer envelope, cc. 1, 2, 28:9–20, with the kindred element in c. 27 (vss. 3–8, 19, 24 f., 51*b*–53, 62–66) and 14:28–31; 17:24–27, besides its markedly apocryphal and legendary character, gives clear evidence of a date not

[1] *Kerygma Petri*, fragment in Cl. A., *Strom.* 6:5, 43.

[2] The case is different with Jas., and perhaps 1 Pt. and the Pastoral Epistles.

[3] There were doubtless earlier unauthoritative writings regarding words and deeds of Jesus, but among his authorised representatives writings of an evangelic character would be strongly discouraged by two considerations: (i.) the writing down of the teachings of a rabbi was regarded as a shameful offence. They must be preserved *memoriter*, lest they encroach upon the sacred prerogative of "Scripture." (ii.) The second coming was expected almost momentarily.

earlier than 80–90 A.D. It seems to be connected with that final recast of the gospel which, besides absorbing the whole of Mark, has thrown the material into an artificial numerical scheme,[1] and left innumerable marks of editorial manipulation and piecing.[2] Luke either treated the "envelope" with contempt,[3] or, far more probably, had never heard of these data. The reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, most incongruously inserted in 22:6 f. (cf. Lk. 14:21 ff.), the sacramental formulæ, 26:28 (cf. Mk. 14:24) and 28:19 (trinitarian) adjusted to the later practice,[4] the rule of procedure in the discipline

Present form of Matt. late.

[1] For the scheme of 4:18–9:35; 9:36–13:58, see p. 190. In cc. 14–18, cc. 19–25, and cc. 26–28 the events and order are from Mk. Corresponding to these five periods of the ministry are five masses of discourse material agglomerated into artificial groups: (i.) the Sermon on the Mount, cc. 5–7 (original separate discourses in Lk. 6:20 ff.; 11:1–13; 12:13–34, etc.); (ii.) Mission of the Twelve, c. 10 (original discourses in Lk. 10:1–12; 12:1–12, etc.); (iii.) Parables, c. 13 (note the addendum, vss. 44 ff. to make seven Parables; cf. vss. 34–36); (iv.) Woes against Pharisees, c. 23 (taken from the *Denunciation* in Galilee, Lk. 11:37–54 = Mk. 7:1–23, and the *Warning against Pharisaism* in Jerusalem, Lk. 20:45–47 = Mk. 12:38–40); (v.) Eschatology, cc. 24, 25 (original discourses in Lk. 12:35–13:9; 17:20–18:7; 21:5–36, etc.). For numerical pragmatism in detail, note 1:1–17, *three* divisions of 2 × 7 generations; 5:21–48, *five* new laws of the second table; 6:1–18, *three* works of righteousness; cc. 8, 9, *ten* mighty works; 13:1–52, *seven* parables; 23:13–32, *seven* woes, etc.

[2] In addition to the twenty-two duplications above cited (p. 193), the agglomerated discourses, and the addendum, 13:44 ff., after 13:34–36 of the preceding note, observe the separation of 4:18–22 from 8:14–17, "when even was come," 8:16 (cf. Mk. 1:21, 32), and the colophon of vs. 17; etc.

[3] Cf. Lk. cc. 1–3 and 24; Cor. 1:18 f.; 2:38; 10:48, etc.

[4] First occurrence of baptism in the name of the Trinity in Διδ. and Justin M. For the earlier practice cf. Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:48; 19:5; 1 Cor. 1:13; 6:11; Gal. 3:27; Rom. 6:3.

of "the Church," 18:17,[1] and the frequent adjustment of the narrative to the exact wording of the Old Testament (*e.g.* 19:18; 21:2 ff.; 27:34, 43 [=Wisd. 2:18]) are by no means the only internal evidences of the lateness of this editorial recast.[2]

Elements taken from the *Logia*.

We cannot even allow that the whole of the discourse material is derived from the *Logia;* some of the omissions of Luke would otherwise be unaccountable, as well as the fact that two-thirds of the coincident discourse material shows so abrupt a difference in the degree of divergence.

Other considerable portions of the discourse element omitted by Luke, however, must have belonged to the *Logia*,[3] and we gladly accept the careful demonstra-

[1] Cf. the insertion of the parables of the tares among the wheat, 13:22–30, 37–43, and the net, 13:47–50; the wedding-garment in 22:11–14; the term ἐκκλησία; and the interest in church discipline generally in c. 18.

[2] If we may judge from the generalising character of 28:16–20, it is simply one of the many attempts to supply the missing ending of Mk. (cf. v. 16 with Mk. 16:7, in contrast with Matt. 28:7). The genuine ending must have gone on to relate the rehabilitation of Peter in fulfilment of the angel's promise (v. 7; note "and Peter," and cf. Lk. 24:34; 1 Cor. 15:5, and *Gospel of Peter*, close) substantially as in Jn. 21:15–19. When Matt. 28:16–20 was written this account was therefore already lost.

The turning of the point of the parable 21:33–41, originally directed against the unworthy *rulers* (cf. v. 41 and Mk. 12:9, 12), by means of v. 43 into a rejection of the *nation*, shows an editor who looks back on the *national* humiliation. The introduction of "the Pharisees" in v. 45 to share the blame shows who are his present antagonists.

[3] Lk. 6:20–49 is far more correct as a representation of the actual Sermon on the Mount than the heterogeneous agglomeration of Matt. cc. 5–7. Nevertheless it is incorrect in omitting Matt. 5:17–22, 27, 28, 31, 32*a*, 33–41; 6:1–6, 16–18, which form the negative side of the argument (cf. Lk. 6:27*a* with ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω, Matt. 5:22 etc.). Other instances might be cited.

tion of B. Weiss that certain elements of the *narrative* are by no means merely borrowed from Mark, but by their greater simplicity and brevity, as well as by the repeated support of Luke in minute variations, prove their independence, if not their priority.[1] But the proportion of this pre-Marcan narrative element of Matthew, which can have belonged *originally* with the *Logia,* is very minute indeed.

[1] *E.g.* Matt. 15 : 21–28 is more original than Mk. 7 : 24–30, which omits the obnoxious verses Matt. 15 : 23, 24; Matt. 20 : 22 f. than Mk. 10 : 38–40, which works in Lk. 12 : 50. The supposed "abridgment" of Mk. by Matt. ignores important facts and is not the invariable practice of Matt. himself. In Matt. 8 : 2–4 = Mk. 1 : 40–45 it is Mk. who embellishes, as proved by Lk.; cf. Lk. 5 : 12 f. with Matt. *vs.* Mk. A considerable number of similar passages can be cited, especially in Matt. 8 : 23–34; 9 : 18–26, where but for ἀρτὶ ἐτελεύτησεν (render with Mk. ἐσχάτως ἔχει) the simplicity of Matt. is original. In Matt. 14 : 1–13 the few words of the original can be restored from Lk. 9 : 7, and ran as follows: Ἤκουσεν δὲ Ἡρῴδης διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι, Ἰωάνης ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν. Ὁ γὰρ Ἡρῴδης ἀπεκεφάλισεν Ἰωάνην ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ. Καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ (sc. Ἰησοῦ, misunderstood by Matt.[iii]) ἐλθόντες ἀπήγγειλαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ κτλ. The added material in Mk. 6 : 14–29 is derived from popular romance. Again in Mk. 8 : 34–9 : 1, in 9 : 33–37, in 10 : 10 f., in 10 : 15, it is Mk. who imports the foreign material. The parallels of Matt. in 16 : 13–28, in 18 : 1–4, in 19 : 1–8, and 13–15 would have been irreproachable but for a later hand which has introduced from Mk. Matt. 16 : 24 f.; 18 : 5 f.; 19 : 9, *in every case introducing a second time and at a wrong place a passage already contained in the gospel*, viz. Matt. 10 : 39 (cf. Lk. 17 : 33; Jn. 12 : 25 f.); Matt. 10 : 40; Matt. 5 : 30 (misplaced); Matt. 5 : 31 f. Of these all but 5 : 30 stand in their true connection. Other examples might be cited.

Further evidences that Matt. had already received narrative additions before final supplementation from Mk. may be found in 8 : 1–22, a section calculated to follow 4 : 18–22 in the order 4 : 18–22 . . . 8 : 14–16 (17), 1*b*–13 (cf. Lk. 7 : 1–10; Jn. 4 : 46–54 6 : 1 ff.), 18 ff., but broken up by the present artificial order. Similarly 13 : 34 ff., etc. See below on Lk.

Results as to the formation and type of Matt.

The history of our gospel appears, therefore, to include three stages: (i) Matthew^{i}, the Aramaic *Logia*, almost entirely without narrative framework; (ii) Matthew^{ii}, an edition in Greek supplied with an outline of the public ministry and passion, and a very sparing enrichment of the discourses; (iii) Matthew^{iii}, a complete recast grouping the discourse material (with additions) into five great masses, taking up the additional material of Mark, retouching much of the parallel material of Matthew^{ii}, and supplying some legendary accretions in connection with the external envelope already described.

From the characterisation of the gospel by Irenæus (*Frg.* 29), as intended "to prove to the circumcision that Jesus was their expected Messiah," down to that of Köstlin, which adds, "although Israel refused to recognise him as such," there has never been entire failure to recognise the circle from which this gospel emanated and to which it is addressed. Jewish Christian only in the innocent sense of the Epistle of James, without a trace of hostility to Paul, and fully recognising that the prerogative of Israel must pass to a worthier people,[1] brought in from the Gentiles,[2] it retains many traces of the undeveloped particularism[3] and Jewish coloration[4] of the earliest days. Salvation comes by keeping the moral commandments of Scripture as interpreted by the new Law of Love. To be "perfect," Christ's example of unlimited self-sacrifice must be followed.[5] He is the Son of David,[6]

[1] 21 : 43 ; 22 : 7 ; 27 : 24, 25.

[2] 2 : 11, 12 ; 3 : 9 ; 8 : 10–12 ; 12 : 21 ; 15 : 28 ; 21 : 28–32 ; 22 : 1–10 ; 28 : 19.

[3] 5 : 47 ; 7 : 6 [?] ; 10 : 5, 6, 23 ; 15 : 22–27 ; 18 : 17 ; 19 : 28.

[4] 5 : 23, 24, 35 ; 17 : 24–27 ; 23 : 1–3, 16–22.

[5] 19 : 16–21 ; cf. 5 : 17–48 ; 23 : 1–3.

[6] 1 : 1–17, 20 ; 2 : 1 etc. So called eight times, four times "king of the Jews" (2 : 2 ; 21 : 5 ; 25 : 31 f. ; 27 : 11).

foretold by the prophets, King and Saviour of the scattered flock of Israel,[1] and Judge of the world.[2] On the other hand, no gospel is so relentless in its denunciation of the blind guides of nomism, who are to blame for the perversion of Israel from its salvation,[3] while the constant appeal to Scripture fulfilment[4] is but one of many signs that the struggle is against the scribe and Pharisee of the rabbinic period.[5]

Anti-rabbinic.

That which is of supreme importance to us, however, is the admirable fidelity with which the teaching of Jesus is reproduced, scarcely altered even by the crucial events of 66–70 A.D.[6] The few exceptions are mostly mere minute alterations or resettings of genuine sayings.[7]

Mark. Its author and place of origin.

When Lk. 1:1 was written John Mark was by no means the only "minister of the word"[8] who had already "taken in hand to draw up a comprehensive narrative" of the facts delivered by the eye-witnesses; but his was the most important, or it would not have been made the framework of Lk. 4:31–24:9.

[1] 10:6; 15:24. [2] 25:31, 32. [3] C. 23.

[4] 1:22 f.; 2:5 f., 17 f., 23; 3:3; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17–21; 13:35; 21:4, 5; 27:9, 10.

[5] Cf. 3:7; 16:1, 6, 11, 12 [*vs.* Lk. 3:7; Mk. 8:5]; 15:20; 6:1–18; 9:13; 11:28 f.; 12:5–7, 38; 16:1 [*vs.* Lk. 11:16; Mk. 8:11]; 21:45; 22:41; 23:1 ff., 35, 36.

[6] Cf. 24:15–20 with Lk. 21:20, 21, and 24:29 with Lk. 21:24, where even Mk. omits *εὐθέως*.

[7] 12:40; 16:18; 18:17; 19:17 (cf. Mk. 10:18; Lk. 18:19); 21:43. Even 12:40, which Westcott and Hort themselves are disposed to regard with suspicion, is probably only altered from the form Lk. 11:30. Matt. 17:24–27 is a paradoxical *logion*; genuine, but probably avoided because supposed to imply a grotesque miracle. Matt. 22:6 f. is the only instance of perversion.

[8] *ὑπηρετής*, applied specifically to Mk. in Acts 13:5.

He was the son of a certain Mary, in whose house in Jerusalem we find the infant Church assembled.[1] This house, to which Peter, when released, at once betakes himself, may well have been that of the famous "upper room";[2] whence the step is easy to the conclusion that the nameless lad who, roused from his couch by the midnight band of Judas seeking their victim, ran to give the alarm, arriving at Gethsemane just too late,[3] was John Mark himself, who in these singular verses has left, as has been poetically said, "the artist's autograph in an obscure corner of the painting." Barnabas was his mother's brother,[4] and he thus came into association with Paul,[5] but turned back to Jerusalem, to Paul's displeasure, when only the first part of the first missionary journey was accomplished.[6] Barnabas, nevertheless, subsequently took him with him, and, as in Philem. 24; 2 Tim. 4:11 he again appears in friendly relations with Paul, the fault must have been forgiven. Col. 4:10 is sometimes regarded as indicating the beginning of his relation with Peter, of which the only other trace in the New Testament is 1 Pet. 5:13 (but cf. Acts 12:12), where both the expression "my son" and "Babylon" are doubtless to be understood figuratively, as all antiquity agrees. Rome, in fact, is both traditionally the place of origin of the gospel and is suggested by the internal evidence.[7]

[1] Acts 12:12. [2] Acts 1:13 f.; Lk. 22:8–13.
[3] Mk. 14:51 f. [4] Col. 4:10.
[5] Acts 12:25; 13:5. [6] Acts 15:37–39.

[7] Note the explanation of Jewish expressions and words (3:17, 22; 5:41; 7:11, 34; 9:43; 10:46; 14:36; 15:22, 34, 42) and Jewish customs (7:3, 4; 14:12). A Roman origin is particularly indicated by the addition 10:12, based on a peculiarity of *Roman* law, the Grecized Latinisms 2:4, 9, 11; 5:9, 15; 6:27, 37, 55; 7:4, 8; 12:14; 14:5; 15:15, 39, 44, 45, and the explanation in 12:42 that two λεπτά make a *quadrans*.

As before, the remarkable modesty of the claims put forth in tradition on behalf of the gospel as the compilation of Peter's "interpreter" after his death in Rome, is the guarantee of their antiquity. Indeed, from Papias down what seems to strike the historical critic is that the claim is too modest, and the "order" of this gospel is so much better than any of the other three that it almost requires us to assume that the material must have undergone readjustment, perhaps expansion, since the tradition was formulated.[1] But of this we have no evidence; for, unlike Matthew, this gospel seems to have had no uncanonical rivals to its title, and, when employed by Matthew, must have had substantially the same content as now. The original ending is lost, 16:9–20 being wanting in the best manuscripts, and now known to have been taken from the work of Aristo, and the "shorter ending" of other texts merely patching the gap indicated by 14:27–31, 66–72, and 16:7. But if additions have been made to the original they were of the slightest.[2]

Character in ancient tradition.

If we ask why a gospel which of all the four supplies the best outline of Jesus' public career, preserving even a good degree of historical perspective, should have borne the reputation of being deficient in order, the answer must be that the author of this early criticism was not thinking of the general outline, which was a common possession[3] already apparently so stereotyped as to have fastened the great

Why deficient in "order"?

[1] Reuss and others regard the tradition of the Presbyter as referring to a simple narrative underlying our Mk.

[2] Mk. 9:38–40 and 12:41–44 known to Lk. seem unknown to Matt. 1:2 f. is the only instance of the gospel in which the evangelist quotes Scripture on his own account. Here 2*b* is not from "Isaiah" whom Mk. professes to quote; but has been added from Matt. 11:10 = Lk. 7:27. Mk. 9:49, 50*b*; 10:12, 38*b*, 39*b* are the only other passages we find reason to suspect.

[3] Cf. Acts 10:36–42; 13:23–31.

events of the gospel history for all our Synoptists within the too narrow limits of a single Jewish church year,[1] but of the sequences in detail, wherein the criticism is justified.[2]

Graphic traits.

For the first glance at our gospel should suffice to show that its author did not rely upon his ability to relate personal experiences of Peter with Jesus, hitherto unknown, or even to draw such a distinctive portrait as that of John. He does preserve traits of the eye-witness, but they appear in the form of a multitude of minute embellishments of a story already fixed. Sometimes these touches are mistaken inferences,[3] but in a host of cases are fresh, lifelike, inimitably historical.[4] Nowhere in the Gospels do we stand so near to the eye-witness of Jesus' healings as in the two stylistically connected incidents, peculiar to this gospel, Mk. 7:31–37 and 8:22–26. The sign language of Jesus to the deaf and dumb man interprets his thought as if he stood before us.[5] The blind man's description of his returning sight is inimitable. Yet just these are the incidents, just such are the graphic embellishments (cf. 5:3–10 and 9:20–27 with parallels), which Matthew and Luke barely mention, or wholly omit.

An explanation of these and similar phenomena[6] may

[1] So the fathers generally, *e.g. Clem. Hom.* 17:19, "Jesus abode a whole year."

[2] See p. 189.

[3] *E.g.* in 5:12, 30; cf. Matt. 8, 31; 9:22; in 1:24 (= 5:7); 1:34*b*; 7:11; cf. Matt. 8:29; also in 6:56; 8:20, etc.

[4] *E.g.* in 1:29–34; cf. Matt. 8:14–16, note also 2:4; 3:5, 20 f.; 4:38; 5:8–10; 6:31, 39; 11:3.

[5] "Looking up to heaven he sighed" betokens appeal to divine help in *prayer*, cf. 9:29; 11:22–24. (Against Gould, *Intern. Comm.*, 1896.)

[6] *E.g.* the characteristic form of double statement of Mk. which led Tübingen critics to the notion that the gospel had

be found in the suggestion that Matthew and Luke are guided in their omissions and changes, many of which will otherwise appear arbitrary or frivolous, by a knowledge that their authority, Mark, himself depends on authorities, some of which were in their own possession, so that they do not always choose to follow Mark's embellishments.[1] The evidence of the gospel itself is, in fact, conclusive that its origin is not from mere memory or oral tradition, but from careful putting together of written sources which the evangelist modestly undertook rather to adjust together and embellish with graphic touches from the Apostle's discourse, than to supersede by a narrative altogether his own. The proof of this statement rests mainly on three considerations: —

Why omitted by Matt. and Lk.

(i) Besides the general tendency to duplication in expression, a very considerable element of the gospel repeats, section by section, the same story which, in a more or less widely different version, had already been related.[2] This phenomenon at the same time

Mk. a compilation of written sources.

borrowed by turns from Matt. and Lk. So 1 : 32 (cf. Matt. 8 : 16; Lk. 4 : 40), 42 (cf. Matt. 8 : 3; Lk. 5 : 13), etc.

[1] The omission of descriptive healings like Mk. 7 : 31–37; 8 : 22–26; 9 : 20–27 by Matt. and Lk. is less surprising than Mr. Badham imagines. The later evangelists have no liking for *processes*. They prefer to depict the omnipotence which "cast out the spirits *with a word*" (Mt. 8 : 16).

[2] Not mere individual incidents are told in duplicate, but a connected series. Thus Mk. 7 : 32–36, 37; 8 : 1–9, 10, 11 f., 13–22*a*, especially if compared with the parallel Matt. 15 : 29–16 : 12 will be seen to be a briefer, simpler account of the *series* of incidents already related in Mk. 6 : 32–44, 45–52, 53–56; 7 : 1–23 (3 : 20–35); 7 : 24*a*, though the identity is not apparent until we compare with the latter its parallels in Matt. 9 : 27–34 = Matt. 12 : 22–50 = Lk. 11 : 14–51; 12 : 1 ff. Instead of the present impossible tangle of itineraries we obtain thus the following: Scene of the Feeding — Gennesareth — Capernaum — Bethsaida — Cesarea Philippi. [Here the account Mk. 8 : 27–

explains the singular omission by Luke of Mk. 6:45–8:26; for it is just this section which contains the principal duplications, and, as we shall see, Luke sometimes goes even too far in his endeavour to avoid this fault.

(ii) It is now admitted among critics that the occasional coincident variations of Matthew and Luke from Mark cannot be accidental; and, as knowledge of our Matthew by Luke is incredible, the deviation must be by Mark from a source underlying all three.[1] Again, we have already cited many passages in which Mark has unmistakably developed and added to the simpler story presented in Matthew.[2] At least one older narrative source was therefore certainly used.

(iii) Too many of the seeming dislocations,[3] misunderstandings,[4] and misadjustments of material[5]

9:1, 11–13 (except 8:34 f., 38*a*) should be followed by 7:24–31.] Then Tyre — Sidon — Acco — border of Galilee and Samaria (Lk. 9:51 ff.; 17:11) — Scythopolis — Capernaum. Mk. 9:2–10 again interrupts the connection of vss. 11–13, the sequel to 8:27–9:1. There is further duplication in 8:31–33 (= 9:30 f. = 10:32–34), 9:33–37 (= 10:35–45), and 10:13–16 (= 9:36).

[1] As one instance out of many, note how the omission of the words "Who smote thee?" in Mk. 14:65 has made unintelligible the "Prophesy." But cf. Matt. 26:67 = Lk. 22:63. Note also Matt. 8:2, 3 = Lk. 5:12, 13 embellished in Mk. 1:40–42.

[2] Observe as typical instances of the parenthetic style thus produced the series of belated imperfects in 5:8–10 (cf. Matt. 8:29), and the seven (!) consecutive participles in 5:25–27.

[3] As 3:19*b*–35 (on account of vss. 34 f.), 1:40–45; 3:1–6, etc.

[4] As 6:8 f., where the teaching of the missionary's right to depend on his hearers for all needful things is changed into a prescription of simplicity of dress.

[5] As the most flagrant instance take 11:22–24, which should follow 9:14–29 as in Matt. 17:20; cf. Lk. 17:6. The sym-

can be accounted for by comparison of Matthew or Luke to be in all cases mere illusions of the critic.

Why so little trace of the *Logia*.

There is one source which Mark, if he knew it, passed over with a bare extract or two, viz., the *Logia*. But he has left indications in the gospel itself that his omission of discourse material was not from ignorance, but intentional. For 4:33 implies a knowledge of more of the parables, and 1:13 that the nature of the temptations was known. Moreover, in the exceptional cases where the course of his narrative requires the insertion of more or less discourse material we have often scarcely more than a reference, almost always secondary in character and often misplaced.[1] Had Mark approached his task regardless of current usage, which certainly distinguished between an Apostle's report of the Lord's teachings and mere accounts of his life, unauthoritative, however useful in supplementary explanation, we might feel surprise at this seeming neglect. But we can readily understand it if he regarded his own work as

bolic judgment on Israel 11:12–14, for whom the fig-tree is merely a prophetic symbol chance has brought in the way, is taken as a judgment on the tree itself, and made to take effect by the appending of 11:20–25. Vss. 20 f. are editorial solder, 22–24 from the connection of Matt. 17:20 (Lk. 17:6), vs. 25 from that of Matt. 6:14. Matt.^{iii} here follows suit. Lk. omits. Less conspicuous misplacements are 8:34 f.; 14:55–64, where Matt.^{iii} follows, but Lk. corrects. C. 13 affords many instances.

[1] The substitution in 1:7 f. of the Baptist's *answer* (cf. Lk. 3:16; Jn. 1:26) for his *preaching*, Matt. 3:7–10 = Lk. 3:7–9, transforms the whole conception in the later sense, and in turn affects Matt. (εἶπεν for ἀπεκρίνατο, Lk.; ἀπεκρίθη, Jn.); 1:15 is affected by the preaching Lk. 4:21 (cf. 6:1–6); 1:24 by Matt. 8:29, from which Mk. deduces a general theory 1:34; 3:11 f. Displaced *Logia* fragments in 2:28; 4:22, 24*b*; 8:34 f., 38*a*; 9:37, 41–50; 10:11, 15, 38*b*, 39*b*; 11:22–25; 12:38*b*, 39; 13:9–13, 21–23, 33–37; 14:25 (?).

belonging to this supplementary class. Apparently he aimed to reëdit for the benefit of readers familiar with the "teachings," several existing, unauthoritative accounts of the "doings," with such additions and enrichments as his special relations with Peter enabled him to give.[1]

The tradition rightly describes our Mk.

Properly interpreted, the tradition as to Mark's gospel is corroborated in every point, including date, location, and qualifications of the writer. Historical interest is pronounced, almost to the exclusion of doctrinal, though the writer shows his opinion on the question of the controversy at Antioch, 7 : 19*b*. His fidelity to the sacred teaching of Jesus in c. 13 is practically as pure as Matthew's. While the testimony of Irenæus makes it certain that some of the predicted events, if not actually transpiring, were already matter of history, the bare omission in vs. 24 of the εὐθέως of Matt. 24 : 29 is the only change open to the suspicion of accommodation to the known

[1] We can only wonder that he should have shown these anonymous narratives the respect he did, *e.g.* the retention of both versions of the Feeding of the Multitude shows remarkable regard for even minute differences of statement in the sources. Mk.'s embellishment and explanations vary in value. Thus 1 : 6, 20*b*, 33, 35 ff., 43, 45 ; 2 : 1, 4 ; 3 : 3–5*a*, 7–10, 19*b*–21, 32 ; 4 : 10–25, 38 ; 5 : 3–6, 8–10, 15 f., 18–21, 22–43 *passim* ; 6 : 31, 37, 40 ; 7 : 17–23, 32–36 ; 8 : 14–19, 22–26 ; 9 : 14–16, 20–29 (mostly) ; 10 : 24, 32 ; 11 : 4, 11, 16 ; 12 : 13, 32–34 (41–44) ; 13 : 3 ; 14 : 13–15, 51 f. ; 15 : 7, 16–19, 21*b* might well rest on testimony accessible to him alone. Often they are mere inferences from the text, as 1 : 13*b*, 34*b* ; 2 : 7, 15*b*, 16*b*, 18*a*, 20 ; 3 : 11 f., 14–15*a*, 30 ; 4 : 33 f. ; 6 : 16, 12 f., 56 ; 7 : 26*a*, 30 ; 8 : 20 ; 10 : 49 f. ; 11 : 2*aβ*, 20 f. ; 14 : 30, 72*a* (δίς) ; 15 : 44 f. ; or explanatory additions, as 7 : 2–4 ; 14 : 7*b* ; sometimes false inferences, as in 5 : 13, 30*a* ; in at least one instance a popular report of a highly fanciful kind, 6 : 16–29 ; cf. 15 : 38. Of a disposition to absolve his readers from the duty of critical scrutiny there is no trace whatever.

event.[1] It indicates the lapse of a year or two at least after 70 A.D. The fact that c. 13 is the only instance in which our evangelist constructs an elaborate discourse, is also indicative of the beginnings of the murmur, "Where is the promise of his coming?" 2 Pet. 3:4. What we must guard against is the hasty assumption that Mark's work represents in the main original composition rather than compilation and redaction.

Lk.-Acts. Why attributed to Luke.

The traditional connection of the double work, Luke-Acts, with "the beloved physician"[2] dates back at least to the Muratorian Canon, and may even account for Marcion's preference for this gospel. Of Luke we know simply that he was a physician, a Gentile,[3] and a companion of Paul at Rome. The diary of a companion of Paul is used in Acts 16:10–18; 20:5–17; 21:1–18; 27:1–28:16, who can scarcely have been other than Luke,[4] and this is quite sufficient

[1] The theory of Colani, Weiffenbach, and others of the incorporation in c. 13 of a small Jewish apocalypse is sufficiently refuted by E. Haupt (*Eschatol. Aussagen Jesu*, 1895). Remove the material taken from Mt. 10:17–22 and Lk. 12:36–46, and nothing remains but the commonplaces of current Jewish expectation of the last days, adapted to answer the question of vs. 4; cf. 2 Esdr. 9:1–8; 16:18; 6:24 f.; 5:9 and the Enoch fragment *Barn.* 4:3. That Jesus accepted these expectations as *in some sense* justified is apparent from 1 Thess. 4:15–17. Cf. *e.g.* Mk. 13:27 with 3:29, Matt. 13:30; 40–42, 47–50; 1 Thess. 4:17, etc.

[2] Col. 4:14; Philem. 24; 2 Tim. 4:11.

[3] Col. 4:11.

[4] There has been just enough of effort on the part of Schleiermacher, De Wette, Bleek, and Beyschlag in favour of Timothy, of Schwanbeck and others in favour of Silas, of Horst and others in favour of Titus, as author of the "Travel document," or "We-narrative," to show how difficult it is to find a companion of Paul better fitted to the case than Luke, who is favoured by most critics as well as by tradition.

to account for second-century tradition regarding the authorship of both parts of the work. But the first person of Lk. 1:1–4; Acts 1:1 is not necessarily the Diarist. A compiler who takes such pains to maintain the intensely Hebraistic style of 1:5 ff. in all its contrast with the Preface, might well shrink from obliterating the most fascinating characteristic of the Diary, even if not himself its author. Theophilus and his other immediate readers would be in no danger of drawing false inferences. Doubtless we should presuppose the correctness of the identification made by the Fathers; but neither Scripture nor experience of their other inferences guarantees it. If the general design of the work is not of a character attributable to the author of the Diary, or the material appears to have been adjusted to conceptions insupposable in a companion of Paul, nothing requires us to regard Luke as the evangelist-historian. Careful study of style, vocabulary, phraseology, adaptation of material to purpose, proves the writer indeed an author rather than mere compiler, but gives us no name.[1] The Diary forms but a minor element of the substructure, of little influence and much overlaid. The overlying strata are those which give the work its present character, and these are not what we should expect from a Gentile and companion of Paul.[2]

Relation of the Diary to the whole.

[1] For statistics exhibiting the pronounced "Lucan" style and vocabulary see Vincent, *Word Studies*, 1889; Thayer's *Lexicon of N. T. Greek*, 1896, Appendix; Simcox, *Writers of the N. T.*, 1892; and Hawkins' *Horæ Synopticæ*, 1899. It is admitted that a general individuality pervades the whole work, conclusively showing the author to have made the material wholly his own, while preserving much that was characteristic of the source.

[2] Even the prefatory sentence Acts 1:1 contains an unmistakable Aramaism (ἤρξατο, see Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, 1898, I, p. 21), while the Hebraisms derived from O. T. usage, not likely

Remove the Diary and Mark, and the general characteristics appear tenfold more salient, and these seem to point rather to a believing Hellenistic Jew of the same type and period as the author of our Matthew, though a far more skilful and cultured writer.

Hebraistic elements

It is true that an intensely Jewish style and point of view characterise that special source already noted which we not only may, but must, distinguish from the work of the compiler (whom we may designate R); for the material not found elsewhere hangs together as an organic whole, pervaded by a uniform purpose and a uniform conception and phraseology,[1] and, to

to be copied by a Gentile, are not confined to special sections like Lk. 1 : 5-3 : 38, but while mainly characterising the author, extend even to the Pauline speeches and the Diary (*e.g.* ἐπὶ παντὸς προσώπου τῆς γῆς 17 : 26 and καὶ ἐγένετο 21 : 1, 5 ; 27 : 44 ; 28 : 8, 17. See Dalman, *op. cit.*, pp. 23, 26, 33). Note also the dating by "the Fast," 27 : 9.

[1] There are references forward and back from Lk. to Acts, and *vice versa* (*e.g.* Lk. 24 : 47–49 to Acts cc. 1 ff., 4 : 27 to Lk. 23 : 7–12), and various habits of expression, as in describing the effect of divine manifestations, usually in the form, "and great *fear* came upon all that heard, and they glorified God" (Lk. 1 : 65 ; 2 : 9, 20 ; 5 : 26 ; 7 : 16 f. ; 8 : 25 ; 9 : 34 ; 13 : 17 ; 24 : 37 ; Acts 2 : 43 ; 5 : 11–13 ; 19 : 17, etc.). There is a typically Jewish interest in quoting prayers and psalms in full as in Chr., Dan., Ezra, Neh., and the later literature (Lk. 1 : 46–55, 67–79 ; 2 : 14, 29–32 ; Acts 1 : 24–26 ; 4 : 24–30) ; the elaborate report of speeches, dialogues, and documents is a kindred feature (Lk. 4 : 16 ff. ; Acts 2 : 15–40 ; 3 : 12–26 ; 4 : 8–12 ; 5 : 35–39 ; c. 7 ; 10 : 34–43 ; 11 : 1–18 ; 13 : 16–41 ; 15 : 7–21, 23–29 ; 17 : 16–31 ; 20 : 18–35 ; c. 22 ; 23 : 26–30 ; c. 24 ; c. 26 ; 27 : 21–26 ; 28 : 17–28). Christ as the Prophet like unto Moses (Lk. 7 : 16, 39 ; 24 : 19–27 ; Acts 3 : 22 ; 7 : 20–37, etc.) and as the suffering "Servant" of Isaiah (Lk. 24 : 26, 45 f. ; Acts 3 : 13, 18 ; 4 : 27 f. ; 8 : 29–35, etc.) are illustrations of pervasive ideas. For phraseology note *e.g.* the appellative "the Lord" (Lk. 7 : 13, 19 ; 10 : 39-41 ; 12 : 42 ; 13 : 15 ; 17 : 6 ; 18 : 6 ; 19 : 8, etc. ; Acts 5 : 9, 14 ; 9 : 11, 15, 29, 31, etc.), and cf. Lk. 1 : 70 with Acts

end all doubt that R has really incorporated some of the sources which he admittedly had at command (Lk. 1:1), there are references to portions which he has omitted,[1] others to incidents whose form he has altered[2] or has developed in a different sense.[3] Now, if the working over showed any considerable Gentile interest, the explanation of conservatives like B. Weiss would be plausible, viz: The Jewish features belong to the sources employed by the Diarist, imperfectly concealed or purposely left unchanged. But such is not the case. The *over*lying strata, as much as any, show the characteristic Jewish point of view. Traces of working over attributable to a Gentile hand, if any exist,[4] are extremely slight, superficial, and

Characterise the compiler's work.

3:21, Lk. 15:17 with Acts 12:11, Lk. 7:30 with Acts 20:27, Acts 12:17 with 21:40, etc. Other important characteristics will appear later.

[1] Lk. 24:34; Acts 1:15, 21; 9:31 f.; 19:16, etc. Among R's omissions should be included Jn. 7:53–8:11 which Blass (*Philology of the Gospels*, p. 157 f.) is quite right in saying must have stood "originally" after Lk. 21:36. It is of the very bone and flesh of Lk.'s unique *material* (cf. *e.g.* Lk. 7:36–50), but never had a rightful place in our canonical gospel. Vss. 37, 38, are framed expressly to take the place of this story which R *declined* (for obvious reasons) to incorporate. The editors of the late Western texts, which insert it after Lk. 21:38, took it doubtless from the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, where Eusebius found it, inserting it as nearly as they could in its "original" connection. A. Pott, in his *Abendl. Text der Apg.*, 1900, received since these pages were in type, has proved that some Western readings are in fact, as here suggested, survivals from the precanonical sources.

[2] Acts 10:41–43; cf. Lk. 24:36–49 with Jn. 21:5, 9, 12 and the *Kerygma Petri* in Ign. *ad Smyrn.* 3.

[3] Acts 11:15–17; cf. 2:1–4, 15 ff. and 5–11.

[4] So the chronological errors Lk. 2:2 (an insertion of R, against the sense of the original, cf. 1:5) and Acts 5:36 f.; and the conception of the Sadducees as a *religious* sect, Acts 4:1 (καὶ οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι), 2*b* (= R), 23:6–8. In Lk. 2:22 read

doubtful, while the compilation, as a whole, is adjusted to a conception which centres in Jerusalem and views Christianity essentially as the true and Scriptural Judaism. The Diary is itself overlaid, and the expansions are not only in the interest of the general scheme, but are of the same purport as the alterations made in material drawn from Mark and the *Logia*.[1] Moreover, even these occasionally show as characteristically Jewish a point of view as the most Jewish of the sources.[2] The Diary we know to be the earliest narrative element of the New Testament; but in Acts cc. 1–12, where the main stock of the Lucan history appears unburdened of foreign

Elements not from the Diary.

αὐτῆς. Dalman (*op. cit.*, p. 32) gives linguistic evidence to show that the author was ignorant of Hebrew and Aramaic; but none of these count against authorship by a *Hellenistic* Jew.

[1] Thus Lk. 4 : 16–30 substitutes for the opening scene of Jesus' ministry in Mk. one which though out of place (Lk. 4 : 23) is specially adapted to foreshadow the entire work in both its parts; Lk. 5 : 3–10, also misplaced (cf. 4 : 38), transforms the call of the Four Mk. 1 : 16–20 into a call of *Peter*, corresponding with Peter's part in Acts cc. 1–15 (cf. Lk. 9 : 28, 32 ; 12 : 41 ff. ; 22 : 8, 31 f., 61 f. ; 24 : 12, 34). Similar treatment has befallen the *Logia*. In the Sermon on the Mount Lk. 6 : 20–49, the section contrasting the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees with the new Law is omitted, while an anecdote is appended in 7 : 1–10 to illustrate Gentile faith in contrast with Israel's obduracy.

[2] Vision is not a matter of exceptional temperament, as in the case of Paul (2 Cor. 12 : 1 ff.), but is the stereotyped mode of divine guidance. In Acts 9 : 12 we have even vision of vision. Like the frequent "angels" it is a literary device, entirely justifiable among Orientals. Peter's scruples against eating with the Gentiles are thus overcome Acts 11 : 3–10; whereas we know from Gal. 2 : 11 ff. that Paul's rebuke was the real agency. It pervades Lk. cc. 1–3, reappears in 9 : 28–36 ; 22 : 43, and c. 24, pervades Acts cc. 9, 10, 12 ; but also interprets to the reader the significance of events *in the Diary* and adjoining sections. Besides 16 : 9 note 18 : 9 f. ; 23 : 11, and 27 : 23.

material, not only is it admitted by all schools of critics to be certainly composite in structure, but its very elements have varied from one another and from the facts to a degree unaccountable at an early date.[1] The principal author, if a Gentile, had so absorbed the spirit of his Jewish sources that it completely dominates, not the style alone, but the purpose and content; if a companion of Paul, personal interest in the missionary hero had disappeared behind reverence for the Apostolic function. Paul's career is dropped from the moment the Church has been planted at Rome, as Peter's is after the recognition of Gentile

Typically Jewish.

[1] In c. 12 Peter's providential release from prison — probably through the sudden death of Herod in the summer of A.D. 44 (cf. Jos. *Ant.* 19 : 8, 2) — is but slightly idealised, the angel of death of vs. 23 being really the same as the angel of deliverance of vss. 7 ff., and the tradition still retaining highly realistic features (vss. 10–15). Still it manifestly cannot be dated less than a score of years or so after the event. The replica in 5 : 19–25 has not only lost all historical motive and connection, but stands in a connection overflowing with anachronisms (note the egregious anachronism of 5 : 36 f., cf. Jos. *Ant.* 20 : 5, 1 f.; also the officialism of the later Church in 6 : 1 ff. — "widows"; the "evangelists" [21 : 8] conceived as deacons, etc.) and legendary accretions (5 : 1–11, 15, 16), even the phraseology reflecting the period of Roman persecution (cf. 5 : 41 "rejoicing . . . to suffer for the Name" with 1 Pet. 4 : 4–16, Herm. *Vis.* 3 : 1, 9 ; 3 : 2, 1 ; 3 : 5, 2 ; *Sim.* 9 : 28, 2, 3, 5, 6). The redactor who imposes a strange sense upon the gift of tongues in 2 : 4–11, against the sense of the speech (2 : 15–18), the source (11 : 15), and the facts (1 Cor. c. 14), can scarcely have known the phenomenon as a living reality. "Tongues" had already "ceased." He views the Pentecostal gift from the standpoint of the Hellenistic litterateur, as a parallel to the giving of the Law, which tradition reported to have taken place *at Pentecost*, the voice from Sinai dividing into 70 languages (for the 70 nations of the world) "as sparks fly from the anvil." See Hausrath, *Hist. of N. T. Times*, II, ii, p. 117, Philo. *De Decal.*, and below p. 227, note [1].

equality at Jerusalem. He is not even reckoned an Apostle, save in the broader sense, along with and after Barnabas,[1] but a subordinate.[2] Peter receives the special Pauline revelation, and becomes the true Apostle to the Gentiles.[3] Yet the writer is anything but unfriendly to Paul. He simply seems never to have taken into his mind the things which to Paul were vital.[4] Against such facts we have need of more than the retention of the first person in the Diary sections, and a tradition, probably based upon it,[5] to make Lucan authorship of the whole easy to accept.[6]

Author's qualifications.

Of more real importance than the author's name are his qualifications for his task, which he himself defines, not as personal acquaintance with Paul, still less as supernatural inerrancy, but simply as acquaintance with many sources (πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν), comprehensive researches (πᾶσιν παρηκολουθηκώς), and a purpose to write the story from remote beginnings (ἄνωθεν), with greater accuracy (ἀκριβῶς) and better chronological order (καθεξῆς) than his predecessors.

[1] Acts 1 : 21 f. ; 11 : 30, etc.

[2] 9 : 26–30 ; 13 : 1–3 ; 15 : 22 f.

[3] Acts 9 : 32–11 : 18 ; 15 : 7, 14.

[4] Cf. Acts 9 : 22–30 with Gal. cc. 1, 2, and Acts c. 15 with Gal. c. 2. Also the author's apparent lack of acquaintance with the Pauline epistles, which cannot be accounted for by an early date.

[5] The Western reading "one of us" for "one of them" in Acts 11 : 28 can scarcely serve for more than to show what inferences were drawn in the second century as to Antioch's being the traditional home of Lk.

[6] We only mention here the further difficulties of the redaction of Acts, changing the character, not only of the glossolaly (2 : 1–11), but of the community of goods (2 : 44 ; 4 : 32 ; cf. 5 : 4 ; 12 : 12), officers (6 : 1 ff.), and other institutions of the primitive Church, and in Acts 28 : 17–28 carrying the pragmatic theory of 13 : 46 to the point of ignoring the existence of a Gentile church in Rome.

By observing the use made of Mark, the *Logia*, and the Diary, and their adaptation to the predominant source, we may gain an insight into his purpose and some idea of the earlier work on whose lines he built.

Design of Luke-Acts.

We may understand the silence of Papias as to our author's work, by realising how different was its purpose from that of the simple, early records of the sayings and deeds of Jesus. His was a "History of Christianity in its Origin and Progress," designed to show that its rejection by Israel and consequent planting among the Gentiles were in accordance with the divine purpose as foretold in Scripture, and were divinely directed. His "former treatise" showed how the awaited Redemption had come to Israel and been rejected by all save a remnant — the poor, the lowly, the weak, publicans and sinners, Samaritans and women; his second showed how in further fulfilment of the Scriptures, and by the power of God exerted through its risen Head, the Church had grown up in Jerusalem, extended to the Gentile world, and become established from Antioch to Rome. Part I relates Messiah's Humiliation in his unwelcomed coming to Israel; Part II, his Triumph in the creation of a new People of God. There is no adequate reason to regard it as incomplete.[1]

Shown in its outline.

The opening chapters of Luke, including 4:16–30, where Jesus cites the examples of Elijah and Elisha for "turning to the Gentiles," form the prelude to the drama,[2] whose first climax is the crucifixion and resurrection, when Jesus opens the Scriptures and proves that "thus it was written of him." The theme

[1] Against the inference from πρῶτον (Acts 1:1) of a missing third part. For πρῶτος instead of πρότερος, see Matt. 21:28, 31.

[2] Cf. Lk. 2:32–35; Acts 7:51–8:4, 26 ff; 9:15, 20–25, 29 ff.; cc. 10, 11; 13:1–4, 7 ff., 40 f., 45–48, etc., and see J. Weiss, *Absicht u. Char. d. Apg.*, 1898.

thus led up to (Lk. 24:44–49) is restated and developed in Acts (1:1–5, 8). Peter establishes the Gospel in the centre of the Jewish world and vindicates its universalism. Paul is driven by the obduracy of Israel to fulfil the counsel of God by planting the Church in Greece and Rome, "as the Holy Ghost had spoken by Isaiah the prophet," Acts 28:23–28.

Peculiar material.

But this theme was not the invention of R. A kindred purpose characterises the materials which must have come down to him from the very earliest times. The material peculiar to the gospel runs as follows after the characteristic cc. 1–4: the Call of Peter to be a Fisher of Men;[1] the Widow of Nain;[2] the Baptist's Acceptance with the Lowly;[3] the Sinful Woman forgiven;[4] Ministering Women;[5] Samaritan Village;[6] Parable of the Good Samaritan;[7] Mary and Martha;[8] Introduction to Discourse on the True Riches;[9] Murdered Galileans;[10] Crooked Woman healed;[11] Parables of the Chief Seats, the Feast of the Poor, Counting the Cost, the Lost Piece of Money, and Prodigal Son, Right Use of Unrighteous Mammon, and the Rich Man and Lazarus;[12] the Error of

[1] 5:1–11 (*vs.* Mk. 1:16–20). Parts of vss. 1, 3*b*, 4*a*, 10*a* are enrichments from the parallels in Mk. See note 4.

[2] 7:11–17.

[3] 7:29 f. Note the similar interest in Matt. c. 11.

[4] 7:36–50. Verses 37, last clause, 38, last clause, and 4*b*, and the name "Simon" are embellishments drawn from Mk. 14:3–9, which R wrongly omits as another version of the same.

[5] 8:1–3; cf. 24:22; Acts 1:14 f.

[6] 9:51–56. [7] 10:25–37.

[8] 10:38–42. Is this chivalrous treatment of women in opposition to teaching illustrated in the fragment from the *Two Ways*, where John cites a command to exclude women, based on alleged frivolity of Mary and Martha? See Hilg. *N. T., extra can. rec.* 4, 118.

[9] 12:13–21. [10] 13:1–5. [11] 13:10–17. [12] Cc. 14–16.

those who think they have Merit;[1] the Samaritan Leper;[2] the Widow (God's "elect") avenged;[3] the Pharisee and Publican;[4] Zacchæus the Publican.[5]

Character of the special source.

We should expect Luke to be able to draw, as he does, with special copiousness from his unique source in the story of the Passion and Resurrection, for it aimed to show that "so it behooved the Christ to suffer and to enter into his glory"[6] and wound up with the charge to the disciples to go forth to all the nations with this message.[7] But besides the usual contrast between the high and the lowly, as in Herod's Mockery, 23:7–12, *vs.* the Penitent Thief, 39–43, the items added here often supplement Matthew and Mark with historical data,[8] especially with reference to Peter.[9] There are others which, not having been deemed worthy a place in the original Luke, have only crept in through the inferior Western text, attaching themselves at the point indicated by their position in the uncanonical gospels from which they were taken.[10]

[1] 17:7–10. [2] 17:11–19. [3] 18:1–8. [4] 18:9–14.

[5] 19:1–10. The special peculiarities of style characteristic of Lk.'s unique material are far too numerous for mention. Some have been already noted (p. 213, note [1]); others will strike every attentive reader in phraseology which certainly is not R's (cf. Lk. 13:16 with 19:9 and 3:8) and other minor marks, but it is chiefly the all-pervasive purpose in the selected material which proves a single directing mind. One need hardly cite the continuation in Acts of the peculiar interest in Samaritans (Acts 1:8; 8:5–25), John the Baptist (Acts 1:22; 10:37; 13:24 f.; 18:24–19:7), women (1:14; 9:36–43; 12:12–15; 17:4), and the poor (2:45; 3:1 ff.; 4:32 ff.; 9:36; 10:2, 4, etc.).

[6] 24:26 f., 46.

[7] 24:44–49. Constant appeal to Deutero-Isaiah is a distinctive feature of Lk.-Acts.

[8] 22:27–31. [9] 22:31 f., 35–38, 49–51, 61; 24:12.

[10] The so-called "Western" text is a form of the Lucan writings which, along with much mere scribal corruption, in-

Of course, we must not assume that this fundamental source of Luke-Acts is present only where the material does not happen to coincide with Matthew and Mark. On the contrary, we have already noted a curious diversity in the discourse material common to Matthew and Luke, one-third of which only has verbal identity. The two-thirds which has but slight verbal resemblance may readily be credited to the *Logia*, both from the nature of its content (the Sermon on the Mount and many parables and teachings) and the checkered history of this early collection.[1] But

Relation to rest of Lucan material.

troduces occasional enrichments like the *Pericope Adulteræ*, Jn. 7 : 53–8 : 11 (see above, p. 214), which appear to be actual survivals of the pre-canonical form of the sources. In this instance the narrative survived in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (Eus. *Hist.* 3 : 39, 16). Between this gospel and the *Kerygma Petri*, the principal fragment of which parallels Acts 17 : 24–31 and 7 : 41 ff., some unexplained relation existed. The *Kerygma* (*ap.* Ign. *ad Smyrn.* 3) had also a version of Lk. 24 : 36–49 containing the features referred to in Acts 10 : 40–42 (cf. Jn. 21 : 13, 15 and Lk. 24 : 43 Vulg.). The "Western" addition to Matt. 20 : 20–28 occupies the true historical position of the parable. The canonical form, Lk. 14 : 7–11, is forced into an incredible setting (cf. 14 : 1, 7*a*) by the displacement of the original setting (cf. Lk. 22 : 24–27 with Mk. 10 : 35–45). Here the uncanonical form is certainly more "original," though never a part of Lk. Similarly Lk. 24 : 12, though part of the source (cf. 24 : 24), owes its preservation to other hands than the author of the gospel. The mass of these survivals gravitates toward Lk.-Acts as meteorites beset the earth's orbit where the parent body was absorbed. See also the additions to Lk. 6 : 4, and especially to cc. 22–24, and the work of Pott above referred to (p. 214, note [1]).

[1] The very different phraseology would indicate that it came to Lk. in a different version from Matt.'s. The bold omissions (*e.g.* Matt. 5 : 17–42 ; 6 : 1–6, 16–18) suggest an early date when material was abundant and selection free. The *Logia* elements will have already formed part of a complete narrative when R incorporated Mk., but their adaptation to the "Lucan"

the other one-third evinces a much more direct literary dependence, and by its content and character is unlikely to have ever formed part of the *Logia*. It is confined to the portions relating to John the Baptist and the period before the public ministry of Jesus, and some of the discourses in the earlier part[1] of the so-called "great interpolation."[2] But here we *invariably find dependence, as regards the source,*[3] *on the side of Matthew,* while the nature of the content corresponds to the unique material of Luke, already described.[4] We can only conclude that the presence of this element in Matthew[ii] is to be accounted for as a very sparing enrichment of the *Logia* by kindred material drawn from this self-same Lucan source.[5] In two instances

Relation to Matt.

scheme is unmistakable. Note *e.g.* the above-mentioned omission from the Sermon on the Mount and the appended narrative, Lk. 7 : 1–10, illustrating *Gentile* faith (cf. Lk. 4 : 16–30). Matt.[iii] takes it over in 8 : 5–13, but loses the special significance.

[1] 9 : 51–13 : 35.

[2] Lk. 9 : 51–18 : 14.

[3] Certain minor adjustments, such as the inversion of order in Lk. 4 : 6–12, are readily distinguishable as alterations by the Lucan R.

[4] See, *e.g.*, above, p. 221, note [1], last clause.

[5] This element includes the following: Lk. 3 : 7–9 = Matt. 3 : 7–10, the Baptist's Preaching; 3 : 17 = Matt. 3 : 12, Extract from the Baptist's Answer (cf. Jn. 1 : 19–28); 4 : 3–12 = Matt. 4 : 3–10, the Temptation; 7 : 18 f., 22–28, 31–35, the Baptist's Message and Jesus' Discourse; 10 : 12–15, 21–24 = Matt. 11 : 20–24, 25–27; 13 : 16 f., Denunciation of Galilean Cities and Doxology; 9 : 57–60 = Matt. 8 : 18–22, Volunteer Disciples; 10 : 2 = Matt. 9 : 37 f., Labourers for the Harvest; 11 : 9–13 = Matt. 7 : 7–11, Discourse on Prayer; 11 : 17–26, 29–32, 34 f. = Matt. 12 : 25–30, 38–45, 6 : 22 f., Denunciation of the Generation demanding a Sign (12 : 6–9 = Matt. 10 : 29–33? Encouragement to the Disciples?); 12 : 13–34, 39–46 = Matt. 6 : 25–34, 21; 24 : 43–51, Great Discourse on Earthly and Heavenly Wealth; 13 : 20 f. = Matt. 13 : 33, Parable of the Leaven; (11 : 49–51) 13 : 34 f. = Matt. 23 : (34–36) 37–39, Denunciation of Jerusalem.

only does narrative material appear to have been taken over, except through the medium of Mark, viz. Matt. 8:5–10 = Lk. 7:1–9,[1] and Matt. 8:18–22, — more complete in Lk. 9:57–62 (cf. Lk. 14:26–35). But the remarkable tendency of Matthew[iii] to reproduce Mark in a simplified form, *with variations coincident with Luke*, finds explanation in the influence of an earlier source which all our evangelists employ, but only Luke has utilised in its most fully developed form.[2]

And to Mk.

A higher regard for Mark appears in our author's utilisation of this entire gospel, in its own order, as the groundwork for his delineation of the year[3] of public ministry. His other material, after the opening scene of 4:1–30, is massed in two "interpolations," a smaller in 6:20–8:3, and a greater in 9:50–18:14. For the rest, his departures from Mark consist only of occasional additions[4] and substitu-

Use of Mk. in Luke.

[1] In one or other there has been considerable alteration. Still another version in Jn. 4:46–54.

[2] Lk. himself, though far more willing to borrow from this *Urevangelium* than Mk. or Matt.[ii], shows less respect to it than to Mk., altering freely (cf. Lk. 24:36–49 with Acts 10:40–43) and omitting (Lk. 24:34). Hence the difficulty of establishing priority in triplicate material. But cf. the additions of Mk. to Lk. and Matt. in passages above cited (p. 206), and note that, while Lk. is not free from expansions, both Matt. 3:1–4:11 and Mk. 1:1–13 must be abridgments of Lk. 3:1–4:13 (see note on p. 379 and cf. Matt. 3:6 = Mk. 1:5 "confessing their sins," with Lk. 3:10–14). So the official trial of Jesus, Lk. 22:66–71, is absurdly confounded in Mk. 14:53–65 and Matt. 26:57–68, with his detention and ill-treatment in the house of Caiaphas. The features of the Transfiguration Story, Mk. 9:2–8, which in Lk. has independent traits and is of extraneous origin in Mk. (cf. p. 207), suggest priority in the Lucan source.

[3] A single year of public ministry seems to have been the conception of Mk. adopted both in Matt. and Lk. in spite of indications in the material of all three of a duration of at least two years. Jn. corrects the error.

[4] Additions are made in Lk. 5:39; 9:31–33*a*; 19:1–28, 41–

tions,[1] accompanied by a constant minute change of phraseology, wherein the coincident variation of Matthew often shows Luke more faithful than Mark to the proto-gospel. The omissions can be accounted for, without exception, as intentional, usually to avoid duplication (real or fancied) of matters elsewhere given in a version derived from other sources.[2]

Composition of Luke.

We find, then, that the main stock of Luke is a kind of proto-gospel; for in some much earlier form part of its discourse material was added by Matthew[ii] to his version of the *Logia*, and part of its narrative material incorporated by Mark; but the meagre use made of it is hardly compatible with apostolic standing or authority. Moreover, when used as the groundwork of Luke it was at an advanced stage of development, some parts being far later than others in origin,[3] and the narrative was already supplied

44 [21 : 1–4] ; 21 : 37 f. ; 22 : 15–18, 28–32 (34 ?), 35–38 (43 f.?), 51, 61*a* ; 23 : 2, 4–19, 22*b*–25, 27–31, 39–43.

[1] For Mk. 9 : 11–13 we have Lk. 1 : 17 ; for 6 : 17–29, Lk. 3 : 19 f. ; for 6 : 1–6, Lk. 4 : 16–30 ; for 1 : 16–20 ; 3 : 9, Lk. 5 : 1–11 ; for 13 : 14 ff., Lk. 21 : 20–28 ; for 10 : 35–45, Lk. 22 : 24–27 ; for 15 : 16–20*a*, Lk. 23 : 11, 36 f.

[2] Thus Mk. 3 : 20–30 = Lk. 11 : 14 ff. ; Mk. 4 : 26–29 (supposedly) = Lk. 13 : 18 f. ; Mk. 6 : 45–8 : 26 (supposedly) = Lk. 9 : 10*b*–18*a* ; 11 : 14, 16, 29, 37 ff. ; 12 : 1 ; Mk. 11 : 12–14 (supposedly) = Lk. 13 : 6–9 ; Mk. 12 : 28–34 = Lk. 10 : 25–28 ; Mk. 14 : 3–9 (supposedly) = Lk. 7 : 36–50 ; Mk. 3 : 20 f. ; 6 : 5 ; 7 : 24–30 ; 8 : 22–26, 32 f. (cf. Jn. 6 : 70) ; 9 : 20–26 ; 15 : 34 f. were probably felt to be objectionable, and 7 : 1–23 ; 9 : 43–49 ; 10 : 1–9 unsuited to the work.

[3] Thus Lk. 4 : 16–30 (in part) ; 13 : 1–17 ; 18 : 1–14 ; 19 : 1–10 and the like must in substance be very early. *Per contra*, cc. 1, 2, besides being unknown to Matt.[iii], must be subsequent to the Adoptionist heresy (see Beyschlag, *N. T. Theology*, vol. ii, p. 481 [Engl.]), and narratives such as 7 : 11–17 ; 23 : 40–43 and 24 : 36–43 can scarcely be regarded as untouched by legendary influence. It may be well to repeat, however, that

with its sequel on the preaching of the Gospel to the nations.[1]

Composition of Acts.

The phenomena of Acts are similar. All admit that written sources must have been used to relate the founding of the Church in Jerusalem, cc. 1–5,[2] and the evangelisation of Samaria and the sea-coast, cc. 6–8. Most scholars will grant, further, that the sources for these two cannot have been the same, for cc. 6–8 presuppose a different account of the beginnings from that we have, and carry us quite beyond the section 9 : 32–11 : 18, wherein Peter carries the Gospel to the same regions, and reaches, by supernatural revelation, the result which, in cc. 6–8; 11 : 19–30, happens as an unavoidable result of persecution.[3] Between the two comes the episode of Paul's conversion, written from the standpoint of

even these late elements are not the work of R. This is proved by the contrasted style of 1 : 5 ff. after 1 : 1–4, and still more decisively by the discrepancies between substance and editorial retouchings (cf. 2 : 2 with 1 : 5, the reversal of the order of the Genealogy and completion of it up to Adam, and adjustment of the Resurrection tradition to a theoretical centre at Jerusalem, etc.).

[1] Lk. 24 : 47–49 ; cf. Acts 10 : 42.

[2] The duplication of 4 : 1–31 by 5 : 17–42 has been spoken of. We might say 4 : 32–5 : 42 = 2 : 43–4 : 31, but in 5 : 12 the occasion for the interference of the authorities, the healing of the lame man, has been omitted. Other duplications in cc. 1–5 are discovered by B. Weiss, Spitta, and others.

[3] C. 7 displays a decidedly Alexandrian conception of the O. T. revelation (cf. *Barn.* 4 : 6–8 and 14 : 1–4 ; Heb. 3 : 5–6 and *Kerygma Petri*, *ap.* Cl. Al. *Strom.* 6 : 5), and appears to have been adjusted to the story of Paul by insertions in 58*b*, 59 ; 8 : 1. The incident of Simon Magus, 8 : 9–24, aims to disparage the arch-heretic, whose subsequent injury to the Church is alluded to in 8 : 23.

Duplications.

a Jerusalem Christian, 9:1–31,[1] and followed by the account of the Pauline Gentile mission, in cc. 13, 14, with its sequel, c. 15, which again settles the question not only of the admission but of the *eating with Gentiles* as well, which had previously been settled by divine revelation to Peter, 10:9–16; 11:3–10. As we know from Gal. 2:11–21, neither account is strictly correct, though that of cc. 10, 11 is much more highly idealised. With this are connected the incidents of 9:32–43 and c. 12, which had no direct bearing on the story, but were of interest for the career of Peter.

The speeches.

Without seeking to follow the various attempts to extricate the sources of this Petrine half of Acts,[2] it is enough to point out that the great speeches which, according to the custom of antiquity, are placed in the mouths of Peter and Paul, though admirably adapted to circumstance and speaker, are compositions which form part of the fundamental structure of the book.[3]

[1] The Jewish character of 9:1–31 is very marked including the use of vision in vss. 10–16, which reminds us of c. 10 and the subordination of Paul to the Apostles at Jerusalem in contradiction of Gal. 1:11–24. In fact there need be no real break from 9:1 to 11:18; for the missing account of the church "in Galilee," implied in vs. 31, and the missionary tours of Peter implied in v. 32, may have preceded 9:1.

[2] For the documentary analysis of Acts, see B. Weiss, *Introd.* § 50; Jacobsen, *Quellen d. Apg.*, 1885; Sorof, *Entstehung d. Apg.*, 1890; Feine, *Vorkan. Ueberl. d. Lukas*, 1891; Spitta, *Apg. Quellen*, etc., 1891; Clemen, *Chron. d. Pl. Briefe*, 1893, and *St. u. Kr.*, 1895, and Hilgenfeld, arts. in *Z. f. W. Th.*, 1895-96.

[3] Attempts are made to show alleged Petrine or Pauline features in the speeches. In reality the speech of Paul in 13:16–41 is a replica of Peter's in c. 2 (cf. 13:26–37 with 2:27–39; 3:13–18), that of 14:15–17, expanded in 17:24–31, is the stock address to the heathen in Tatian (*Orat.* IV), Athenagoras (*Leg.* 13), Diognetus (*Ep.* 3), Aristides (*Ap.* 1 and 10),

As the paralleled exploits of Peter and Paul form the warp, so these the woof of Acts, yet they do not represent the latest hand. In the speech 2:14 ff. the gift of tongues is conceived as it really was (see above, p. 216 and cf. 1 Cor. c. 14), and the ascension is an inference, as in Eph. 4:8 ff., from the Messianic gift and from Scripture (vss. 33–36). In the accompanying *narrative*, 1:9–11, the ascension, with the connected second advent, like the baptismal vision (Lk. 3:22) is taken as concrete, tangible reality, while the gift of (fiery) tongues is transformed into a Christian parallel to the phenomenon described in Jewish legend as accompanying the giving of the Law from Sinai, at Pentecost.[1] In the sweeping generalisations as to

Not from the latest hand.

and is found in conjunction with its complement, rebuke of the false worship of the Jew (cf. Acts 7:35–50) in the great fragment from the *Kerygma Petri* in Clem. Al. *Strom.* 6:5. Pauline phraseology is not more conspicuous than Petrine or Lucan, even in Acts 20:18–35 (cf. vs. 28 with 1 Pet. 5:2 ff., and vs. 27 with Lk. 7:30; Acts 2:23; 4:28; 5:38), while the special features of Paulinism — justification by faith, life in the Spirit — are absent or misconceived (13:39). The doctrine of the speeches of Peter is the *author's* interpretation of Scripture (cf. 2:23; 3:18, 21, etc., with Lk. 1:70; 24:26 f., etc.), and, like the sermon of Stephen and the dialogue of Philip and the Eunuch, serve the *author's* purpose of exhibiting the relation in which Christianity stands to the old dispensation. Neither the speeches of Stephen nor of Paul can be conceived as real defences before a tribunal, though account is taken in both very skilfully of the character of the speaker. Cf. the initial sermon of Jesus, Lk. 4:16–30, framed on the basis of Isa. 61:1, 2*a*, and Mk. 6:4, and constituting the theme for the entire work.

[1] See the Midrash on Ps. 68:11 above referred to (p. 216, note [1]): "When the Word went forth from Sinai it became seven voices, and from the seven voices was divided into seventy tongues. As sparks leap from the anvil, there came a great host of the proclaiming voices." Philo (*De Decal.*) already presupposes this legendary interpretation of the "voices

miracles, and community of goods, R is again much inferior to his sources (cf. 5:15 f. with 3:10; 4:16 — the miracle here exceptional, — and 4:32 with 5:4; 12:12).

The contemporary source.

The latter half of Acts is mainly based on the Diary, and here are found those minute and accurate coincidences with historical fact so often appealed to as proof of the accuracy of the entire work.[1] Some, indeed, are found, as we should expect, in adjoining sections (13:7; 17:6, 18), where the early narrative is overlaid, but the graphic realism of the portraiture from c. 16 on, in marked contrast with the idealism of cc. 1–12, makes it superfluous to prove that the story of Paul's great journeys comes mainly from an eye-witness. Here it is only the account of the origins of the church in Ephesus (18:24–19:20), which reminds us of cc. 1–12,[2] though in 28:17–31 the story of the Diary is adjusted to the author's stereotyped idea (cf. 13:38–49), and in 13:6–12 and 16:25–40 the general parallelism between the careers of Peter and Paul becomes more than naturally close. The great speeches with which the plain story of the Diary is embellished in 17:22–31; 20:18–35; 27:21–26, with the three defences in cc. 22, 24, and 26, balancing those of Peter in cc. 2, 3, and 4, are worthy of high commendation when taken, as the practice of the time and indications

and the lightnings" of Ex. 20:15. The *Jewish* source of the ideas in this *secondary* element of Acts c. 2 is important to observe. So the euphemism "his own place," Acts 1:25, becomes luminous in the light of the Midrash which interprets it in Num. 24:25, as "Gehenna." C. 7 is notoriously full of midrashic traits.

[1] See James Smith's *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, 1880[4], and Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller*, 1895, *passim*.

[2] With 19:17 cf. 5:11–13; Lk. 1:65; 5:26; 7:16, etc.

of the work suggest, as illustrations of what Paul *might* have said, in the judgment of a Syrian Christian almost wholly ignorant of his epistles. They should no more be taken for the actual utterances, than the speech of Gamaliel, 4:35–39, the letter of Lycias, 23:26–30, or the private dialogue of Agrippa with Festus, 26:30–32.

Date of Acts.

In opposition to ancient tradition, which made Luke the latest of the Gospels,[1] some modern writers have inferred, from what they deemed the abrupt ending of Acts, a date earlier even than the Fathers assign to Matthew and Mark. In reality, the "former treatise" has been adjusted in the discourse on the overthrow of Jerusalem (cf. Lk. 21:20, 24 f. with Mk. 13:14, 24 f.; Matt. 24:15, 29 f.), not only to the facts of the actual siege, but to a subsequent period of Jewish exile and of treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles. Acts must of course be still later. From the indications already referred to (p. 216 f.), we cannot reasonably date it earlier than late in the reign of Domitian (81–96 A.D.).

[1] The tradition cited by Clement of Alexandria that "the Gospels containing the genealogies are the earliest" may support the priority of the Lucan *source*, but would be contrary to the voice of all antiquity if applied to our Lk.

The *Lives of Christ*, by Th. Keim (Engl., 1876–83) and B. Weiss (Engl., 1883–89), have the most thorough discussion of the nature and origin of the gospel sources. See also Gilbert's *Student's Life of Jesus*[2], 1900, Appendix. Blass's *Philology of the Gospels* touches interesting special points. His *Commentary* on Acts (Latin) is invaluable. J. Morison (1894) and H. B. Swete (1898) have special *Commentaries* on Mark. Godet (Engl., 1887) on Luke, and Hackett on Acts (latest ed., 1882). Special discussions of Acts, principally in histories of the Apostolic Age, *e.g.* Weizsäcker and McGiffert *ut supra*. Discussions of documentary analysis of Acts by Jüngst, Spitta, Feine, Hilgenfeld, *et al.*, all untranslated.

PART V

THE JOHANNINE WRITINGS

CHAPTER X

THE APOCALYPSE AND THE EPISTLES

Place of origin of the Instrumentum Johanneum.

Almost a canon by itself is formed by the group of writings attributed anciently to the Apostle John, consisting of an Apocalypse or "Prophecy," a Gospel, and three Epistles. These are referred, both by tradition and by internal evidence, to Ephesus, one of the most important centres of church life at the beginning of the second century. This is not doubted in the case of the Revelation addressed to "the seven churches of (Proconsular) Asia," and dating from Patmos; nor can we imagine any other location for the three Epistles and the Gospel, whose mystical *theologoumena* so well agree with the whole atmosphere of Phrygian Asia, the home of speculative theosophy, and which are first employed by writers connected with Ephesus. Besides, the type of heresy they antagonise is clearly the docetic Gnosticism of Cerinthus. It may therefore be set down as admitted fact that the Johannine writings, Tertullian's "Instrumentum Johanneum," represent the special contribution of this great centre of early Christianity to the Canon.

The Apostle the only John of Ephesus.

It has indeed been denied, both in ancient and modern times, that all five of these writings, one of which so widely differs from the other four, in subject, in purpose, in attitude toward doctrines and persons, in style, language, and vocabulary, could be from the same hand; so that if the Gospel and Epistles were John's, the Apocalypse could not be. But the extreme scepticism which denies even the presence of the Apostle in Ephesus is purely modern. The tradition of the survival of "the beloved disciple" in Ephesus "down to the times of Trajan"[1] is widespread, uncontradicted, circumstantial, and so ancient as to be presupposed, at least to the extent of the great age and peaceful end of the Apostle, even in Jn. 21:18–23. As against the very considerable mass of tradition relating to the last years of the Apostle at Ephesus, some of it entirely credible, and the explicit testimony of Irenæus and Polycrates as to the intercourse of Polycarp and other Ephesian worthies with the Apostle, of which they knew at first hand, the counter evidence is trivial.[2] The attempt of Eusebius, based on his doctrinal prejudices against Revelation, to find a distinguished presbyter John in Ephesus on whom the book could be fathered has been widely taken up in modern times, but with a failure to appreciate the extreme improbability that

[1] Iren. *Her.* 2:22, 5, quoted by Eus. *Hist.* 3:23, 3. McGiffert appends the note, "The fact of John's continuance at Ephesus until the time of Trajan is supported by other passages, and there is no reason to doubt it."

[2] It is forcibly stated by Badham in *Am. Journ. of Theol.*, Oct., 1899. But much more careful readers of Papias than the mediæval catenists found no allusion to the death of *John* in Papias's comment on Mk. 10:39. Doubtless it was ambiguous, so that later readers took his statement that the prediction had been fulfilled as applying to *both* the sons of Zebedee in the same sense.

Dionysius, the pupil of Origen, from whom Eusebius takes the idea, would have been unable to make a better suggestion than "that there were many with the same name as the Apostle John, . . . for example, John, surnamed Mark, . . . as they say that there are two monuments in Ephesus each bearing the name of John." If, however, there was but one John of Ephesus, it is a violent contradiction of all the testimony, much of it extremely ancient, to maintain that this was not the Apostle.[1]

Nature of "apocalypse."

The New Testament Canon now includes but a single example of the once popular apocalypses or revelations. The denationalising of Israel in and after the exile involved a profound change in the nature of prophecy. The prophet, as spokesman of Yahweh in the government and destiny of the nation, disappeared with the disappearance of nationality. But the Messianic hope was too deeply rooted. With the widening of Israel's horizon it tended to become more and more a hope for all mankind, as religion, losing its national limitations, became the relation of the individual man to the Creator of all. Israel is still the central figure, but its foes are the foes of humanity, its redemption the redemption of the creation. Thus the horizon was indefinitely widened. Again, the increasing hopelessness of Israel's political situation made the aspirations and expectations of the prophets, which, however ideal, had been conceived as operated through intelligible means, more and more incredible without a *deus ex machina*. The only alternative to Sadducean worldliness lay in supernaturalism. Hence prophecy, as it lost its footing on the solid

[1] Against W. Bousset, §§ 15, 16 of the art. "Apocalypse" in Cheyne's *Encyc. Bibl.*, 1899.

earth, took refuge in the clouds. Moreover, scribism had relegated the voice of divine authority to the past. What God had revealed to Moses, Elias, Ezra, Daniel, or still more to the dim and mysterious figure of Enoch,[1] might be received as divine, though the same speculations under the author's true name would have been disregarded. Hence the flood of pseudonymous apocalypses in Jewish circles from 165 B.C. to 200 A.D., whose strange and grotesque visions and symbolism are largely borrowed from Ezekiel and Daniel, but deal fundamentally with themes drawn from the ancient cosmological myths in which the Orient, from time immemorial, had expressed its conception of the world conflict of light and darkness, good and evil, and its hopes of their ultimate outcome. But Messianism, whether of this type, or the more spiritual type of the "meek man," was left to "this people which knoweth not the law" by the scribes of the Pharisees, as much as it was practically antagonised by the Sadducees. *Haggadah* might do well enough for Galileans. For the nomist only *halachah, i.e.* casuistry, was authoritative.

Why pseudonymous.

Christianity came as a reënforcement to all these mysterious hopes and beliefs of the lowly. Jesus himself had adopted the most exuberant language of Daniel, however spiritual the interpretation he might have given it, if we had his interpretation. His official self-designation is probably borrowed from apocalyptic terminology.[2] But Christianity owed to

Christian apocalypse.

[1] Probably the chief figure referred to in Acts 3 : 21 (cf. Lk. 1 : 70) among the prophets who spake of the restoration of all things (ἀποκατάστασις πάντων) "since the world began." Enoch is the chief pseudonym in the "prophetic" literature of this type.

[2] See the copious literature on the title "Son of Man," by Wellhausen, Lietzmann, Appel, and others, cited in Dalman,

him also the consciousness that prophecy was not an exclusive prerogative of the dead past, and "prophets" soon made every Christian assemblage ring with their visions of the glorious Messianic triumphs of the immediate future. It is therefore only what we should expect when the primitive *Christian* "prophet," a John, or a Hermas, disdains the pseudonymity of his Jewish rivals; though of course he still employs the current imagery, phraseology, and cosmological conceptions, which indeed appear not only in Revelation, but in the eschatology of Gospels and Pauline Epistles alike. We certainly have abundant evidence of this flotsam and jetsam of the past in all three, but especially in the Apocalypse of John. We may analyse the book as follows: —

Logical analysis of Revelation.

i. **Introduction**, cc. 1–3. *a.* Superscription, 1:1–3.

b. Address and salutation to the churches of Proconsular Asia, 4–8.

c. The prophet's vision of his call, 9–20.

d. The Spirit's special message to each of the seven churches, cc. 2, 3.

ii. **Vision of the Book of Destiny**, cc. 4–11. *a.* The court of God described, c. 4.

b. The Lamb appears to open the Seal of the Book amid heavenly acclamation, c. 5.

c. First cycle of six plagues, leading up to the Day of Jehovah; suspended climax with the opening of the seventh Seal, cc. 6, 7.

d. Second cycle. Six Trumpets lead up to the impending final consummation, cc. 8, 9; through the Angel of revelation the prophet is recommissioned, cc. 10, 11.

Worte Jesu, I, p. 191 ff. In English N. Schmidt, "Was בר נשא a Messianic title?" in *Journ. Bibl. Lit.*, 1896, and Hommel in *Expos. Times*, May, 1900.

iii. **Vision of the war against the Dragon,** cc. 12–18.
a. The theocracy and Messiah *vs.* the Dragon, c. 12.
b. The Beasts which work for the Dragon on earth, c. 13.
c. The Lamb and his host, c. 14.
d. The Seven Bowls of the wrath of God, culminating in the overthrow of Babylon-Rome, cc. 15–18.
iv. **Vision of the Heavenly Jerusalem,** cc. 19–22.
a. Coming of the Bridegroom and destruction of his enemies, cc. 19, 20.
b. Appearance of his Bride, the City let down out of heaven from God, 21:1–22:5.
v. **Epilogue.** Commendation of the prophecy to the churches, 22:6–21.

Unity of the book.

Whatever the evidences of diverse *origin*[1] in various parts of this complex prophecy, in its present form it is a real unit, the interrelation of whose parts is not mechanical but organic, not superficial but internal. Thus the letters to the seven churches in the prelude (cc. 1–3) have a profound inner connection with the visions which follow.[2] The same applies to the introductory vision, with its description of the glorified Messiah[3] (1:10–18), who addresses the seven

[1] As in the allusion to previous prophecy, 10:11, and interpretation to his readers, 11:4–13, of the current apocalyptic datum of the "two witnesses" (*i.e.* Moses and Elias; cf. Mk. 9:11; 13:4, and the apocalypses cited by Bousset, *Antichrist Legend*, p. 203 ff.). See also below as to the earlier date of 11:1 f.; 17:7–18.

[2] Cf. 2:7*b* with 22:2, 2:11 with 20:6, 14; 21:8, 2:17; 3:12 with 14:1; 19:12; 22:4, 2:26 f. with 12:5; 19:15; 20:4, 2:28 with 22:16, 3:5 with 19:8; 13:8; 17:8; 20:12; 21:27, 3:12 with 21:2, 10; 22:4, 3:18 with 7:13; 16:15; 19:8, 3:21 with 17:14; 20:4.

[3] Cf. 1:10 with 4:1; 10:8, 1:14 with 19:12, 1:15 with

churches, and even more closely to the preface and salutation (1:1–3; 4–9),[1] which have not the slightest trace of "Johannine reserve," but present the personality of the writer, "I, John, your brother and partaker in the tribulation and kingdom," in the strongest and boldest light, just as the conclusion (22:8–21) introduces in reverse order the same personalities in the same bold and authoritative style, "I, John, am he that heard and saw these things." Unless we accuse the author of deliberate falsification, this verse is decisive as to authorship, though not of course excluding such redaction of earlier prophecies of the author's own, and to a limited extent of others, as is characteristic of Old Testament prophets. But if there is pseudonymity we marvel that some great personality, such as Moses, Elias, Enoch, or Daniel, was not assumed; most of all, if that of the beloved disciple, why no claim is made to apostleship. No reasonable alternative remains to the supposition that the author's name was really John, a Jew, the rugged vehemence of whose thought and barbarous solecisms of whose language fail to conceal a conscious mastery of the sublime tenets of the Gospel, even as his familiarity with, and attitude toward, special conditions in each of the seven churches are inexplicable from the mere authority of the spirit of prophecy. Such a tone could not be assumed by every ordinary prophet who received a "revelation" even in the great church of Ephesus, and we have seen what formidable obstacles lie in the way of assuming a second John of

Its explicit assertion of Johannine authorship.

14:2; 19:6, 1:16 with 19:15, 21, 1:17 with 22:13, 1:18 with 4:9; 5:14; 20:1.

[1] Cf. 1:1 with 4:1, 22:16, 1:2 with 6:9; 12:17, 1:3 with 22:7, 10, 1:4 with 4:5; 5:6, 1:5 with 17:14; 19:16; 7:14, 1:6 with 5:10; 20:6; 5:11, 1:7 with 14:14, 1:8 with 21:6; 22:13; 4:8; 11:17; 16:5, 1:9 with 6:9.

the needful greatness side by side with the Apostle at Ephesus, yet unmentioned by contemporaries.

Why the title Apostle is not adopted.

It is objected that the Apostle would have called himself such, instead of modestly classing himself with his "fellow-servants the prophets,"[1] and that he speaks of "the Apostles" objectively.[2] But he speaks no less objectively of the "prophets," among whom he certainly classes himself; and Paul, as we saw, uses the same figure in the same objective way of the Twelve.[3] As to the Apostle's self-designation, it is really much more probable that John did *not* habitually speak of himself as an "Apostle," the term being applied, ca. 100, not so much historically with reference to the sending of the Twelve, as descriptively, to designate the class of peripatetic evangelists.[4] Functionally, John had not been an "apostle" since the day when he took the mother of Jesus to his own home, and the name ἀπόστολος having as yet no sacred associations (for of course it was not the term employed by Jesus) it is less surprising to find that it is altogether the exception when the Fathers who had relations with Ephesus speak of John as "the Apostle." The habitual term, as in Irenæus and Polycrates, is "the *disciple* of the Lord."[5] Functionally, John was "a witness and a teacher."[6] It is doubtful if he would have spoken of himself in the present as an apostle, however much he might magnify his authority as a "prophet."

[1] 22 : 9. [2] 18 : 20 ; 21 : 14.

[3] Cf. Rev. 18 : 20 with Eph. 3 : 5, and Rev. 21 : 14 with Eph. 2 : 20.

[4] Rom. 16 : 7 ; 1 Thess. 2 : 6 ; Διδ. 11.

[5] Thus, the Muratorian fragment speaks of John as *ex discipulis*, though immediately after Andrew is described as *ex apostolis*.

[6] Polycrates *ap.* Eus. *Hist.* 5 : 24, 3.

Dissimilarity to Jn. and 1–3 Jn. in the light of external evidence.

It should be needless to add that objections drawn from the extreme dissimilarity in style and temperament of the anonymous Gospel and Epistles, after the fashion of Dionysius, invert the true state of the case. So far as we have any knowledge of the Son of Thunder from the New Testament outside of these,[1] it is in harmony with the type of mind revealed in Revelation. To use a different portrait, drawn from the Gospel and Epistles *not known to have been attributed to John* before 170 A.D., to disprove the authenticity of Revelation, is the inversion of logic.

Such being the indications of the internal evidence, we cannot but regard it as presumptuous to ignore the fact that "external evidence for the later date (95 A.D.) and the Apostolic origin of the book is stronger than that of any other book in the New Testament."[2] We recall the positive, explicit, and uncontradicted statements of Justin (155 A.D.) and Irenæus (180 A.D.) that this work was written by John the Apostle, Irenæus adding, "at the end of the reign of Domitian" (95 A.D.), and we have the testimony of Andreas of Cesarea that Papias himself not only used the book, but "bore testimony to its genuineness" (see p. 45), which can mean nothing else than that Papias, like Justin, also referred to it as the work of John the Apostle. To dismiss all this peremptorily as "false witness" sounds strangely supercilious in an otherwise singularly judicious Introduction.[3]

Composite origin of Rev.

On the other hand, the concentration of criticism on the question of the composition of Revelation during the last fifteen years has been far from barren. We

[1] As in Mk. 9 : 38 ; 10 : 35 ff. ; Lk. 9 : 54 ; Gal. 2 : 9.

[2] Reynolds in Hastings's *B. D.* art. "John, Gospel of," p. 707*a*.

[3] Jülicher, *Einl.* § 22 : 5.

may sum up the results in the language of one of the foremost critics and commentators: —

> It seems to be settled that the Apocalypse can no longer be regarded as a literary unity. Against such a view criticism finds irresistible considerations.[1] This result holds good, notwithstanding Gunkel's warning against the overhasty efforts of criticism. That a variety of sources and older traditions have been worked over in the Apocalypse will not be denied even by the student who holds that it is no longer possible to reconstruct the sources."[2]

Individuality of ultimate author.

With the above conclusions, and the grounds on which they are based, we find ourselves in complete accord. But Bousset also has wisely counterbalanced the evidence for diversity with equally convincing proof of a relative unity, "that the Apocalyptist is himself an independent writer who has simply introduced various fragments into his *corpus apoca-*

[1] "Among these," continues our author, "is the incongruity between 7 : 1–8 and 7 : 9–17, as also that between 7 : 1–8 and 6 : 12 ff., the two explanations of the 144,000 in 7 : 1 ff. and 14 : 1 ff., the interruption of the connection caused by 10 : 1–11 : 13, the peculiar new beginning made in 12 : 1, the singular character of c. 12, the doublet presented by cc. 13 and 17, the fact that in 14 : 14–20 a last judgment is depicted, whilst that involved in c. 13 does not arrive till 19 : 11 ff. ; the observation that in c. 17 two representations of the beast and his associates are given alongside each other, and the isolated character of cc. 17 and 18 and 21 : 9–22 : 5.

"Further, the chapters do not represent the same religious level. C. 7 : 1–8 (cf. 20 : 7–9), with its particularistic character, is out of harmony both with cc. 1–3, and with 7 : 9–17 ; in 11 : 1 f. the preservation of the temple is expected, whilst in 21 : 22 the new Jerusalem is to have none."

"Moreover, different parts of the book require different dates : c. 11 : 1–2 must have been written before 70 A.D., c. 17 probably when Vespasian had already been emperor for some time, whilst the writing as a whole cannot, at the earliest, have been finished before the time of Domitian."

[2] W. Bousset in *Enc. Bibl.* § 32.

lypticum." This relative unity is shown (1) in the artificial structure of the whole (*e.g.* groups of sevens and artificial connections), and (2) in the uniformity of style and language which is unique in the New Testament,[1] "monotonously diffuse: article and preposition are almost always repeated when there are more substantives than one, as also is the governing word before the governed. Whole clauses are gone back upon and repeated in the negative: Hebrew parallelism is not uncommon."

Why Rev. was questioned after 300 A.D.

It is not surprising that connoisseurs of style, like Dionysius of Alexandria, should have declared it impossible that this writer should have been the same as he whose fluent Greek and Hellenistic conceptions are exhibited in the Johannine Epistles and Gospel, nor that those acquainted, like Eusebius, with the Montanistic and Chiliastic extravagances which appealed to its authority should have begun after the third century to question its apostolicity. But

[1] The defiance of the rules of Greek grammar in Rev. is notorious. (1) Throughout the book are irregularities, wrong constructions (*e.g.* 1 : 5 f.; 12 : 7), and confusions of case, especially with following participles (1 : 4, 10; 2 : 18 [ℵ], 20; 3 : 12; 5 : 11 f.; 6 : 1; 7 : 4, 9 ff.; 8 : 9; 9 : 14; 10 : 8; 11 : 1; 14 : 6, 12, 14; 16 : 12; 17 : 4, 8; 18 : 12 f.; 19 : 6; 20 : 2; 21 : 27 [ℵ]); (2) Hebraisms abound in the construction, as well as in the choice and arrangement of words, occasionally the Hebrew words themselves being introduced, or presupposed (9 : 11; 13 : 18; 16 : 16); (3) Sense constructions are specially frequent (*e.g.* 4 : 1, 7 f.; 5 : 6, 12 f.; 7 : 4; 9 : 3 ff., 13; 11 : 4, 15; 13 : 14; 14 : 3; 17 : 3, 11, 16; 19 : 4, 14) with plural predicate after neuter plural subject (3 : 2; 4 : 5, 8, 9; 5 : 14, etc.), and confusion of gender (9 : 7; 14 : 19; 19 : 20; 21 : 14; 22 : 2); (4) A vast number of systematic peculiarities of idiom, vocabulary, and terminology forbid quite absolutely the identification of this writer with any other of the N. T., in spite of occasional terms (ὁ λόγος, ἀληθινός, etc.) designated Johannine, which may well have become current among Christians at Ephesus.

what is there, unless it be the lofty Christology, which prevents modern critics, who do not admit the direct apostolic authorship of the Epistles and Gospel, from admitting the emphatic testimony of the second-century Fathers of the Ephesian School to the authenticity of Revelation? And is not this very apocalyptic Christology a much needed explanation of that conviction of the primeval Church which could lead even a tolerant Pharisee (of the school of Gamaliel?) like Paul, first to "persecute this Way *unto death*,"[1] and afterward to set its Messiah "at the right hand of God" in his own theological and eschatological system?

The primeval tradition of authorship *and* date probable.

On the other hand, nothing is more certain than the error of the Tübingen critics in attempting to make of this solitary representative, in their system, of the doctrine of the Twelve, an early and an anti-Pauline book. Its heretical antagonists are of the same type as those antagonised by Paul in the same region, Jewish, theosophical, antinomian, but now clearly differentiated and named.[2] As Paul[3] rebukes those Corinthians who committed fornication and partook of εἰδωλόθυτα, "things offered to idols," without restraint, by the example of Israel at Baal-peor, led astray by the counsel of Balaam;[4] as he antagonises an ascetic theosophy in Asia Minor[5] and in

[1] On the ground of Deut. 13 : 6–11, 12 ff. ?

[2] "The teaching of Balaam," 2 : 14 (cf. Num. 25 : 1 ff.; 31 : 16 and 1 Cor. 10 : 7–10; 2 Pt. 2 : 15; Jd. 11), may or may not be the same as "the teaching of the Nicolaitans," 2 : 15; but the clear discrimination of heretical sects outside the Church is the mark of a late period (cf. 1 Jn. 2 : 19).

[3] 1 Cor. 10 : 6–8.

[4] Num. 25 : 1 f.; 31 : 8, 16; cf. Philo *Vita Mos.* 1 : 48–55, Jos. *Ant.* 4 : 6, 6–9.

[5] Eph. 4 : 14; Col. 2 : 8–23.

Corinth, Philippi,[1] Ephesus,[2] a libertinism mingled with "Jewish fables"; so John confronts the same heresies with the same figures.[3] For him, too, the Church is "the Israel of God,"[4] the real Jews[5] the "circumcision";[6] their outwardly circumcised opponents are "a synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews and are not." Over against the "false apostles," and "false prophets" (2:2, 20), John also sees the new Jerusalem founded on "the Apostles and prophets,"[7] though it is clear from the way in which he, as it were, closes the Canon of New Testament prophecy (22:18, 19), that to him also the time is near for prophecies to be "done away."[8]

Internal evidences of late date.

The development (with occasional degeneracy) of the Asiatic churches and differentiation of the heresies is only less decisive as an indication of late date than the stage which has been reached in the struggle with the imperial power. The Jerusalem of fleshly Judaism is still, as to Paul,[9] the seat of Antichrist, "spiritually Sodom and Egypt" (11:8); but what a transformation since Paul's day in the view of Rome! No longer the "restraining," protecting power, a terror only to evil doers; her mighty sword is now the chief instrument of Satan. Rome is Babylon the Great, the arch-enemy, and has been so for so long that there is no need to justify the identification. Nor is there doubt of what has wrought the change. Violent persecutions have broken out in four of the seven churches, the martyrs are a distinct class,[10] their souls are under the altar;[11] the struggle is ever before the

[1] Phl. 3:19. [2] 2 Tim. cc. 2, 3, in part; Rom. 16:18.
[3] Rev. 2:6, 9, 14 f., 20–24. [4] Gal. 6:16.
[5] Cf. Rom. 2:28. [6] Col. 2:11; Phl. 3:3.
[7] Eph. 2:20. [8] 1 Cor. 13:8.
[9] 2 Thess. 2:4 ff. [10] 20:4 ff.; 7:9 ff.
[11] 6:9 ff.

author's mind.[1] But a still greater and mightier struggle than that in which Rome had become "drunk with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus" (17:6), is in immediate prospect.[2] This struggle will turn upon the worship of the beast, *i.e.* as scholars now admit, Cæsar-worship. The great conflict between Christianity and the Roman state religion is foreseen with a clearness, a detail, an implication of so large a part of the struggle already past, as bring us unavoidably down to the later years of Domitian, as the early tradition so explicitly maintained.

Notwithstanding earlier material.

Nor is the fact that much of the apocalyptic material of the book is from an earlier date opposed to such a view. On the contrary, the very inconsistencies of its attempts to identify the beast (a constant of apocalypse generally) with first one, then another, of the emperors, till, in 17:9, 10, 11, the list is extended and reëxtended to admit the author's final view, identifying him with Nero *redivivus*,[3] only proves the more certainly the readjustment of the visions to meet the views we know to have been current in Asia Minor in just this period of the reign of Domitian.[4] Harnack does well to choose as the defi-

[1] 13:1; 14:9ff.; 15:1ff.; 16:6; 17:6; 18:20–24.

[2] 6:9ff.; 3:10, and cf. 7:14.

[3] In 13:18 the number 666 = נרון קסר; the ancient variant attested by Irenæus 616 = נרו קסר.

[4] "Since Eichhorn it has been recognised on all sides, and with justice, that the kings with whom the beast returns for the destruction of Rome are the Parthians, whose satraps might already be regarded as independent kings (Mommsen, *Röm. Kaisergesch.* 5:521). Thus our present chapter (17) also comes into a larger historical connection. As early as the year 69 A.D., a pseudo-Nero had raised commotions in Asia Minor and Greece (Tac. *Hist.* 2:8f.; *Dio Cassius*, 64:9; *Zonaras*, 11:15); in the reign of Titus a second pseudo-Nero showed

nitely determinable starting point for his "Chronology of Ancient Christian Literature" the years 93–96 for the Apocalypse of John.[1]

The other Johannine books.

In strongest contrast of style, doctrinal standpoint, character, and attitude, as regards the personality of the author, are the four remaining writings attributed to John, of which we have to consider first the Epistles, as apparently earlier in date than the Gospel in its present form.

The First Epistle.

But for 1 : 12 ff. we might regard 1 John as a homily rather than a letter, and, as it is, the distinction drawn by Deissmann between *letters* (such as 2 John, 3 John, Philemon) and *epistles* (a stereotyped literary form of the early Church, led up to by the writings of Paul) is fully applicable. But the gnomic style, which gives to 1 John the appearance of an unrelated series of meditations, is the characteristic mode of thought of this individual author, rather than a literary form. An epistle it must be admitted to be, and not without plan or purpose, though the logical sequence is often obscure. We may take the following as exhibiting the general structure.

Logical analysis.

i. **Introduction.** The historical manifestation of

himself on the Euphrates (*Zonaras*, 11 : 18), and was acknowledged by the Parthian king, Artabanus (Mommsen, *ibid.*). About 88 A.D. a third pseudo-Nero again made his appearance, also among the Parthians, and threatened the Roman empire (Suet. *Nero*, 50, Tac. *Hist.* 1 : 2). In this form we find the same expectation also in the fourth Sibylline book, written shortly after 79 A.D. (*Sibyll.* 4 : 19 ff. 137 ff.), and in the oldest portion of the fifth book, written about 74 A.D. (5 : 143 ff. 361 ff.); in the last passage it is associated with a denunciation of Babylon and a prophecy of the rebuilding of Jerusalem" (condensed by Bousset, *op. cit.*, from Zahn "Apoc. Stud." in *ZKWL*, 1885, 1886).

[1] *Chronologie*, p. 245.

God in Christ, the special treasure of the Church, an occasion for writing, 1:1–5.

ii. **Doctrinal.** (*a*) Bearing of the faith against moral indifference, (*b*) against worldliness, and (*c*) against Gnostic self-sufficiency, 1:6–2:11; 2:12–17; 2:18–29.

iii. **Ethical.** Love as the foundation of Christian morality, c. 3.

iv. **Application.** This leads (*a*) to the exclusion of the errorists; (*b*) to edification within the Church; (*c*) to assurance of salvation, 4:1–6, 7–21; 5:1–12.

v. **Conclusion.** The Christian's blessed consciousness of forgiveness and fellowship with God, 5:13–21.

Design in part anti-gnostic.

We scarcely need 2:26 to tell us that "these things were written concerning them that would lead you astray." Without a direct polemic, the entire Epistle aims to build up the churches of Asia against a libertine[1] and docetic[2] Gnosticism, which is no longer within the Church, but has shown its true affinity with the sinful world (4:5) by its unloving separation from the Church.[3] The particular sect of Gnostics known as "Cainites"[4] need not be specially in view on account of 3:12; but the allusions to the boasts of Gnostic *illuminati*,[5] the warning to discriminate against the pretended revelations of their prophets (4:1–6), and the persistent emphasis on the *historic* revelation of the Church,[6] and the adequacy of its illumination by the Spirit and consciousness of eternal life in redemption from sin,[7] makes

[1] 2:4; 3:4–7. [2] 2:22; 4:2. [3] 2:18 f.

[4] See, however, Friedländer, *Vorchristliche Gnosticismus*, 1898, pp. 18–27.

[5] In 1:6, 8, 10; 2:3, 4, 6, 9; 4:5–8, 20.

[6] 1:1–3; 2:13, 14, 24; 3:5, 8; 4:14; 5:6, 11, 20.

[7] 1:3*b*, 4; 2:12, 20, 21, 27; 3:2, 5, 14; 4:7, 12–18; 5:8–12, 13–15, 18, 19, 20.

unmistakably clear, by contrast, the nature of the false teaching and the purpose of the author.

2 Jn. and 3 Jn.

Scarcely any one will now deny that 2 John and 3 John are from the same hand as 1 John. The inimitable style and phraseology [1] require the assumption either of identity of authorship, or of forgery so motiveless as to be absurd. The agreement of the last verse with the first of 2 John indicates that "the elect lady" is a church (cf. vs. 8), for which the warning of 1 John against the docetic errorists is made more specific. Verses 7–11 state the occasion and give the warning. The regular epistolary form is observed.

i. **Salutation**, 1–3.
ii. **Epistolary Thanksgiving**, 4.
iii. **Doctrine and Application**, 5 f., 7–11.
iv. **Conclusion**, 12 f.

Still more concrete, practical, and individual is 3 John, addressed to Gaius, a member of the church, independently written to (in 2 John?), commending to him as host the bearers, who, as they are to proceed on their journey, are perhaps intrusted with all three communications, (*a*) the general circular, 1 John; (*b*) 2 John, the special epistle to the local church, whose bishop, Diotrephes, is hostile to the writer; (*c*) the personal letter, 3 John. It also is in strict letter form.

Internal suggestions of authorship.

Here the strange writer most nearly unveils himself. His name nowhere appears, but he is an "elder" in high authority, hence, doubtless, in the metropolitan church at Ephesus, for his threat in verse 10 implies authority. And yet, we wonder if Diotrephes could so stand out if this were the Apostle John,

[1] 2 Jn. 1 f. 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12; 3 Jn. 3, 4, 8, 11, 12.

and whether, in that case, the threat would take the form of verse 10.[1]

Meaning of the subjective "we."

But 1 Jn. 1:1–4 implies, we are told, a personal relation with the historic Jesus. Undeniably it is the effort of the author to counteract the pretentions of a docetic Gnosticism by emphasising to the utmost the historic tradition in possession of the Church. But it is just the characteristic of this Epistle, and still more markedly of the Gospel in the many passages wherein it pursues the same object, that it fails to say what Revelation so repeatedly and emphatically says, "I, John, am he that heard and saw these things," and which it ought, if possible, to say to produce the desired impression. Where the effort is to substantiate by the most reliable testimony it either refers explicitly to the authority of another[2] or speaks simply in the name of a plurality, whose witness is given in common, and is twofold in its content: (*a*) historical, a faith once delivered to the saints, the treasured common possession of the Church;[3] (*b*) eternal and subjective, the manifestation of the Spirit.[4] The bearers of this witness, whether historical or spiritual, are not only the writer as an official representative of the Church, but all who have received the witness of Jesus, and, conscious of eternal life, "have set to their seal that God is true" (*i.e.* to his promise of redemption).[5] The community of witnesses antedates even Jesus himself. The plurality includes John the Baptist, Moses, and the prophets, who

[1] On 2 Jn. and 3 Jn., see the monograph of Harnack, *Ueber den dritten Johannesbrief* (*Texte u. Unters.*, xv, 3).

[2] Jn. 19 : 35.

[3] 1 Jn. 1 : 1, 2 ; cf. 2 : 24 ; 3 : 5 ; 4 : 13 f. ; 5 : 9 f., 20.

[4] 1 Jn. 2 : 20 f., 27 ; 5 : 9–12 ; cf. 1 Cor. 2 : 6–16 ; Rom. 16: 25–27 ; Eph. 1 . 9 f.

[5] Jn. 3 : 33–36, cf. 1 Jn. 4 : 14 ; 5 : 1–12.

Futile suppositions as to the Apostle.

"speak that they do know and bear witness of that they have seen."[1] Question-begging assumptions of an extreme diffidence on the part of the Son of Thunder, or an inexplicable wish to conceal his identity in spite of the fact that one of the chief *raisons d'être* of the Johannine Gospel and Epistles is the possession by the Ephesian church through John of a direct historical tradition opposable to Cerinthian docetism, are inadmissible in the face of Rev. 1:1, 4, 9; 22:8 f., 18 f.; and even when the authenticity of Revelation is denied are futile as explanations of the conspicuous absence from Gospel and Epistles of direct Johannine authority. We may follow Dionysius of Alexandria by connecting the name of John with the writings which make no claim to it, and are associated with it only by a tradition of the latter part of the second century, whose significance we have yet to examine, and refusing to connect it with a contemporary work of totally different character, which positively claims it; or we may attempt a refutation. We cannot ignore the facts he so distinctly sets forth.[2] So far as the three Epistles throw light upon the question, the indications are all in favour of a totally different author,[3] an "elder" in Ephesus of great, but not strictly apostolic authority, upon whom tradition later conferred the name of John, because of his manifest relation to the Gospel, which embodied the Johannine tradition and soon came to be known by that

[1] Jn. 3:11; 4:38, cf. 1 Jn. 1:3; 4:6, etc.

[2] The whole extract should be read, Eus. *Hist.* 7:25.

[3] Contrast *e.g.* this writer's conception of Antichrist, 1 Jn. 2:18, 19; 4:3; 2 Jn. 7 with that of Rev. c. 13, of almost contemporaneous date. The theory of identity of authorship cannot reasonably be held without an extreme theory of borrowing from other (Jewish) sources (Vischer, Harnack), such as the relative unity of Rev. excludes.

name.[1] The date for Revelation, to which both tradition and internal evidence confine us, 90–95 A.D., considering the extreme old age the Apostle would then have reached, perhaps precludes the most direct form of personal authorship; but the apostolic imprimatur is stamped upon the book (22:8) far more explicitly than upon 1 Peter;[2] and the Baruch who compiled these "prophecies" of the New Testament Jeremiah, if he cast them into a highly artificial mould, must have expressed not only the thought but the language of the seer himself, to enable the tremendous claims of his work to pass unchallenged in Ephesus from the very outset.

Light thrown by the Epistles on the question of Johannine authorship.

The epistles entitled "of John" are clearly from the same region and period, perhaps a few years later. Their author superscribes himself simply "The Elder." That this "Elder's" name was assumed by scribes of the second century to be John was a simple consequence of their manifest relation to the fourth Gospel. If we find reason to think the connection of the name of John with the fourth Gospel has no more direct justification than that of Matthew with the first, there remains nothing to indicate that the unknown Elder's name was John rather than Alcibiades or Melchizedek.[3]

[1] We should remember that Papias merely "employed" the Epistle (and Gospel?), but "quoted" the Apocalypse *as of the Apostle.* Justin Martyr boasts of the possession of the "Prophecy" by "John, an Apostle of the Lord," but if he uses the Gospel uses it only as Papias did the Epistle. Modern criticism finds similar *employment* of Gospel and Epistles in spite of still stronger motives for quoting them *as of the Apostle*, if known to be Johannine, in the Ignatian Epistles (117 A.D.); see E. von der Goltz, *Ignatius von Antiochien* (*T. u. U.* xii, 3, 1894). Citation begins with Theophilus of Antioch (180 A.D.).

[2] 1 Pet. 1:1; 5:12.

[3] For a thorough discussion of present-day criticism of Rev.,

see the article "Apoc. and Recent Criticism," by Barton, *Am. Journ. of Theol.*, Oct., 1898, who rightly commends the analytical keenness of the discussion by Briggs in *Messiah of the Apostles*, 1895. Bousset's *Legend of Antichrist* (Engl., 1896) and article "Apocalypse" in the *Encycl. Bibl.*, 1899, are indispensable. The special theory of Vischer, espoused by Harnack, and most of the documentary analyses are accessible only in German and French (German: Völter, Spitta, *et al.*; French: Schoen and Sabatier). Weizsäcker (*Ap. Age*, transl. 1894–95) has specially sensible treatment of the problem.

On the Johannine Epistles, see Gloag's *Introduction*, 1891, B. F. Westcott, *The Epistles of St. John*, 1892, S. Cox, *Private Letters of St. Paul and St. John*, and the article, "John, Epistles of," by S. D. F. Salmond in Hastings's *B. D.*, 1899.

For foreign literature generally, see bibliographies in the *Commentaries* and *Introductions*.

CHAPTER XI

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO JOHN

Nature of the book and tradition of its origin.

THE fourth Gospel is the effort of a gifted mind, schooled in Phrygo-Alexandrian mysticism, and divinely exalted in the conscious apprehension of the mystery of the faith, to ground the higher Christology of Paul[1] in an interpretation, based on partly independent sources, of the ministry and teaching of Jesus. It is the answer of the church in Ephesus to the exhortation and prayer of Paul (Eph. 1: 15–19; 3: 14–19; Col. 1: 9–18; 2: 1–3. See p. 112).

Tradition, dating from about 180 A.D., making no discrimination of the three elements, — Hellenistic mysticism, Paulinism, Johannine reminiscence, — attributes the book, as a whole, to the Apostle John in Ephesus, at the age of ninety to one hundred years.

[1] Exhibited chiefly in Eph.-Col., but developed in an Alexandrian sense in Heb. The Paulinism of the fourth Gospel has been well brought out by Oscar Holtzmann in his *Johannes-Evang.*, 1887. In particular, its dependence on Eph. is unmistakable in such passages as Jn. 3 : 13 = Eph. 4 : 10; Jn. 3 : 20 f., 12 : 35 = Eph. 5 : 8, 11, 13; Jn. 10 : 16; 11 : 52; 17 : 20, 21, cf. Eph. 2 : 13–22; 3 : 6; Jn. 17 : 24, cf. Eph. 1 : 4, 6; 2 : 4. Note also the Logos doctrine in Eph. 1 : 10, the washing of regeneration, Eph. 5 : 26 (cf. Jn. 3 : 5; 15 : 3); Col. 2 : 11; Tit. 3 : 5, the *unio mystica* in the body of Christ, Eph. 4 : 1–18, cf. Jn. 15 : 1 ff. In Rev. also the influence of Eph. and Col. is manifest; see *Intern. Comm.* on Eph. and Col. by T. K. Abbott, 1897, p. xxviii, and cf. Eph. 2 : 20 with Rev. 21 : 14, Eph. 3 : 5 with Rev. 10 : 7, Eph. 5 : 11 with Rev. 18 : 4, Eph. 5 : 25 ff. with Rev. 19 : 7, etc.

Criticism, once credulously sceptical in its estimate of the capacity of authors to invent, and of churches to adopt a pious fiction, sobered by larger knowledge, tends to-day to admit, as the historical element of the Gospel, trustworthy data and genuine *logia*, resting on the authority of the son of Zebedee, but is more convinced than ever of the need for discrimination, recognition that the data have been mingled with less trustworthy material and wholly recast, the *logia* expanded into dialectic discourses, and the work as a whole adapted to the author's purpose of theological exposition and interpretation, in a manner wholly incompatible with the clear, historical recollection of an eye-witness.[1] The problem of the fourth Gospel is still the most unsettled, the most living, the most sensitive in all the field of Introduction; but not all the controversy has been in vain. The acknowledged leaders can touch hands across the chasm. Champions of the Johannine authorship admit the extremely late date, the extreme subjectivity of the representation, making the story an interpretation rather than a life; the great liberty in utilisation of discourse for the exposition of the author's conception of the doctrine, so that all speakers have the same style and ideas, and these the highly peculiar style and ideas of the Johannine Epistles; finally, the pervasive Hellenistic mysticism. Their opponents have been pushed back, in the matter of date, to within a decade or two of the traditional, have rejected the idea of pure allegorical fiction, admitted (generally) a basis of Johannine authority, and modified the demand for exclusive dependence on the Synoptic tradition as

Present state of the problem.

[1] An admirable review of both elements in the problem, received too late for more than mention here, is given in Wendt's *Johannesevangelium*, 1900, chapters 1 and 2.

invariably correct. We may surely venture to hope even here for something more than a perpetual deadlock.

Logical analysis.

The essential unity of the book is manifest from its carefully studied form. The following structure is traceable: —

i. **The Galilean Ministry**, cc. 1–6. *a*. Prologue. In his preëxistence Christ is to be identified with the Logos, 1:1–18.

b. Before the imprisonment of John. (1) Disciples won at the baptism of John, the sign at Cana, appearance at Jerusalem, and first preaching in Judæa, 1:19–3:36. (2) In Samaria, 4:1–42.

c. In Galilee. (1) Capernaum, 4:43–54. (2) Sabbatarian opposition in Jerusalem, c. 5. (3) The Crisis in Galilee, c. 6.

ii. **The Judæan Ministry**, cc. 7–12. *a*. Jesus at the Feast of Tabernacles, c. 7.

b. Breach with the men of Jerusalem, 8:12–10:21.

c. From the Feast of Dedication to the close of the public ministry, 10:22–12:50.

iii. **The Passion and Resurrection**, cc. 13–20. *a*. Farewell discourses and prayer, cc. 13–17.

b. Death and burial, cc. 18, 19.

c. The resurrection, c. 20.

iv. **Appendix**, c. 21.[1]

[1] The unforeseen result of a threefold division under each of the above three heads recalls the numerical arrangement in this Gospel noted by H. Holtzmann, *Einl.*,[3] p. 438. The Prologue begins with 3 propositions; 3 days are spent with the Baptist; 3 times Jesus is in Galilee; 3 times journeys to Judæa; 3 Passovers and 3 other feasts fall within his ministry; 3 mighty works are related of the Judæan field, and 3 of the Galilean; 3 divisions are expressly made of the discourse on the last day of Tabernacles; 3 disclosures of the traitor are made by Jesus; 3 times he is himself condemned; 3 times Pilate at-

General design.

The author's ultimate purpose is stated in general terms in the formal conclusion, 20:30 f. The seven "signs" given in ascending series from the wine at Cana to the raising of Lazarus, are a selection "manifesting the glory" of Jesus; but the higher type of faith the author principally aims to produce is that which apprehends and ratifies the *word* of Jesus as the key to all truth. Hence the expository dialectic, in which, first, sayings of the Baptist are cited and applied in support (*a*) of the Logos doctrine,[1] (*b*) of Jesus as the suffering and atoning Messiah;[2] second, sayings of Jesus, in support of the principal doctrines of the faith. The subjects are (*a*) [the Resurrection (2:19 ff.)];[3] (*b*) Regeneration (3:1–21); (*c*) Life in the Spirit (4:1–42); (*d*) [the Authority of the Son of Man,[4] cc. 5, 7]; (*e*) Christ the Bread of Life, c. 6; (*f*) Christ the Light of the World and True Shepherd, cc. 8–10; (*g*) Christ the Resurrection and Life, c. 11; (*h*) Christ the Mystical Head of the Church, his Body, cc. 13–17.

Gnostic-baptist tendencies counteracted.

Although primarily for edification, the polemic side glances of the gospel are as unmistakable as those of the Epistles, corroborating the primitive tradition which declared its purpose to have been anti-Cerinthian.[5] Baldensperger,[6] recurring to the habit of the gospel wherever opportunity occurs of contrasting Jesus with the Baptist, noted a century ago by Michaelis, has thrown new light upon this feature of the author's design. Clearly he aims to correct

tempts to save him; 3 words are spoken from the cross; after 3 days he rises and appears 3 times to the disciples.

[1] 1:6 f. 15. [2] 1:19 ff., 26 f., 29–34, 36; 3:22–36.

[3] Perhaps a later addition. See below.

[4] C. 5 is probably displaced. See below.

[5] Cf. 19:34 f. with 1 Jn. 5:6.

[6] *Prolog des vierten Evangeliums*, 1898.

exaggerated views of the personality and work of the Baptist,[1] so that we cannot but be reminded of the curiously abnormal type of Christianity Paul had found at Ephesus, connecting itself with the Baptist, though professing some sort of belief in Christ, and not improbably mingling with it certain speculative elements of an Alexandrian type.[2] To suppose, however, that these were disciples of John the Baptist, pure and simple, is, in our judgment, less probable than to recognise here one of the many Judaistic Gnostic sects[3] of the usual eclectic character, which, after the manner of parasitic growths, had fastened upon the movement of the Baptist, before endeavouring to absorb Christianity. The fact should not be forgotten that by unanimous representation of the Fathers, both Simon Magus, the father of Gnosticism, and Dositheus, his reputed predecessor and rival in Samaria, began *as disciples of John the Baptist*, proclaiming a doctrine of successive reincarnations of the Logos, while Gnostic sects known as Hemerobaptists, Sabæans, and disciples of St. John (*i.e.* the Baptist), perpetuated themselves for centuries in the East.

Other special features of author's design.

Writing when he does, where he does, and as he does, we cannot accept as a complete statement of our author's purpose the general desire to confirm and build up the faith of believers[4] expressed in the

[1] 1 : 8 (note context and emphasis), 15, 19–28 (especially vs. 20), 30, 33; 3 : 25–30, 31–36; 4 : 1 f., 5 : 33 ff.; 10 : 41; 13 : 10, etc.

[2] Acts 18 : 24 f.; 19 : 1–7; cf. Col. 2 : 8–23.

[3] Friedländer, *op. cit.*, pp. 28–40, employs Heb. (by Apollos?) to show the relation of Christianity to the Gnostic sect known as Melchizedekians. Needless to say Proconsular Asia was the hotbed of their speculative eclectic theosophies.

[4] That the intended readers are Christians is apparent, not only from the subject-matter as a whole, but from the frequent

colophon 20:31. We recall the more specific declaration of 1 Jn. 2:26. The two great resources of the Church appealed to by that author, its historic tradition and the inner light, are used again to edify believers, but again *specifically* to fortify their faith against the threatening conditions of their peculiar environment, to wit, the temptations of a vaunting speculative theosophy equally forgetful of the historic reality and of the moral earnestness of the faith. Against this error our author sets up the truth held by the Church, historic and moral. Its doctrine is a revelation profounder than any Gnostic system, and self-demonstrative to the conscience (1 Jn. 5:9–12). Primarily it is the teaching of Jesus, but not the mere *logia* in current use; there is a heart of the doctrine of Christ which appears only by aid of the supplementary teaching of the Spirit,[1] as when it is enriched by all the deeper speculative thought of Paul, whereby a few principles of Jesus are developed into a grander cosmology than Gnostics can boast, and given an eternal and universal application. We have, then, in this gospel the teaching of Jesus as it appears to a mind which looks back upon the Church's conflict of 50–100 A.D. against Hellenistic theosophy, and round about on its Gnostic rivals. No wonder the writer speaks with authority as the conscious possessor of a revelation which reaches the end of religion by attaining fellowship with God.

Resources of the Church. (1) The teaching of the Spirit.

But he has more than a subjective assurance. Special tradition enables him to treat even the Synoptic story with bold independence, supplementing, explaining, correcting, with a confidence attributable

(2) The historic traditions.

assumption of their familiarity with gospel story, *e.g.* 3:24; 11:2.

[1] Jn. 14:26; 15:26; 16:12 ff.

only to apostolic testimony.[1] *Per contra* a closer scrutiny of the freedom with which he handles both the teaching and the story, a freedom marked not so much by disdain as by simple unconsciousness of its inconsistency with historical perspective and environment, forbids our accounting for his frequent superiority of knowledge by supposing him to have been personally an eye-witness.

The Johannine discourses.

We turn first to the discourses. Few will deny that in this gospel the prerogative of the ancient historian to place in the mouth of his characters discourses reflecting his own idea of what were suitable to the occasion, has been used to the limit.[2] It is often impossible to say where the words of the speaker[3] leave off and the reflections of the evangelist begin. Throughout, the style has its own marked individuality, but in vocabulary, in doctrine, in content, it is that of the author of the Johannine Epistles and differs widely from the whole type of Jesus' discourse, as otherwise known.[4] As an illustration take the Johannine "parable." It has a uniform type and subject: "I am the good Shepherd," "I am the bread of life," "I am the door," "I am the true vine," etc. Is this a historical representation of Jesus' characteristic mode of teaching? Apart from all questions of attestation we must decide in favour of the Synoptic representation and against that of John on internal grounds. The former bears the stamp of veracity in

[1] For example, see below, p. 265.

[2] Thus in 18 : 33–38 he can report the private dialogue of Pilate with Jesus, as in 3 : 1 ff. that with Nicodemus, and in 4 : 7–26 that with the woman of Samaria.

[3] *E.g.* 3 : 13 ff., Jesus ; 3 : 27 ff., the Baptist.

[4] We note that Luke also gives new discourses of Jesus, and sometimes adapts them ; but in Luke the new material agrees with the old ; in John all is different.

its admirable adaptation to the historical circumstances and the wise purpose of Jesus. Beginning with a close adherence to the reformatory message of the Baptist, his preaching advances through an impersonal teaching as to the nature of the Kingdom, the character of the new righteousness, the breadth of the love of God. He sows the good seed as widely as possible and in a form adapting it to lodgement and fructification in the minds by which he is surrounded, before he precipitates the crisis by the announcement of his Messiahship. This comes only when the utmost has been done to forestall misunderstanding, and to lift his followers and the public to something like his own conception.

Incompatible with the historic conditions.

The Johannine discourse is utterly wanting in any such adaptation to the known conditions. In form it is enigmatic and abstruse, often polemic; in subject, unsympathetic. From the outset Jesus announces, without reserve, his Messiahship, and the discussions which ensue, dealing with his ethical relation to the Father and to the spiritual life of the believer, are ill adapted indeed to the synagogues of Galilee or the streets of Jerusalem. Should we conceive a background for this subtle dialectic it might be rather the school of Tyrannus in Ephesus, where some successor of Paul reasons on the higher Christology against some unfledged Cerinthus, before a Christian assembly.

Their relation to the cycle of feasts.

The great discourses of the fourth Gospel show, indeed, as we shall see,[1] a certain adaptation to the feasts on occasion of which they appear to be uttered. Thus, the discourse concerning Christ as the true manna, whereby the supreme miracle of Moses is outdone, is given on occasion of the Feast of Unleavened

[1] On the original order of John, which exhibits the relation of the great discourses to the cycle of feasts, see below, p. 273.

Bread. At the ensuing Pentecost, the Feast of the giving of the Law, the authority of Christ and his higher law is set over against the authority of Moses (c. 5). At the Feast of Tabernacles, with its rite of water pouring, we have discourses regarding the bath of regeneration and the invigorating water of life. At the Feast of Dedication, known as the Feast of Lights, from the illumination of the city in celebration of it, Jesus presents himself as the Light of the world. And in the final great discourses at Passover the disciples are taught the doctrine of the true Israel of God, brought into an eternal fellowship with the Father through the Son, in the parable of the True Vine, and the related discourses (cc. 15 f., 14). But it is easy to see that this kind of relation between the feasts and the discourses is of literary, not historical origin.

Composed on the basis of genuine *logia*.

We are far from denying the presence of genuine *logia* embedded in these discourses. In 2:19 we have one indisputably such.[1] In other cases single clauses may be identified with great probability as words of Jesus. In 15:18–16:2 we have a Johannine elaboration of discourse material found also in Matt. 10:17–22. It would be indeed strange if an author of this period, employing the historical form, should not utilise such. But with all due allowance, it is impossible to regard the set discourses of John, as a whole, as other than literary compositions by the author of the Johannine Epistles. The lofty Christology, the mysticism and spirituality of Paul are presupposed in their still deeper, subtler mysticism. The Pauline doctrine of the preëxistence[2] and mission

[1] Cf. Mk. 14:58; 15:29.

[2] 1:1, 14; 3:13, 17, 31–34, etc.; cf. 1 Cor. 8:6; 2 Cor. 8:9; Eph. 1:4; Col. 1:15, etc.

of the Son,[1] atonement,[2] regeneration,[3] life in the spirit,[4] form a dominating element in the author's mind. Is he, then, presenting to us what he conceives the teaching of Jesus actually to have been, or is he purposely idealising? Probably neither. He is not consciously either historical or unhistorical. He simply frees his own mind on these essentials of Christian doctrine without considering the question of historicity. But we may well ask, Could the mind of an eye-witness and peculiarly devoted follower of Jesus be so emptied of the veritable utterances of the Master as to leave room for such idealisation? When we consider how others were perpetuating the historical discourses an affirmative answer is not easy.

Historical material similarly elaborated.

Similar conclusions are still more obvious in our author's treatment of his historical material. Here we have the same extreme liberty, hand in hand with a limitation almost equally extreme. The story of the Synoptic Gospels is presupposed. There is dependence upon it, sometimes mistaken dependence.[5] The outline of the career of Jesus is sketched in a manner not merely out of harmony with the triple tradition, but irreconcilable with the historical situation, and with the narrative itself. The call of the Messiah, the foundation stone of the Synoptic story, which in Mark forms "the beginning of the Gospel," is not simply displaced, as in Matthew and Luke, by a miraculous Messiah-birth, but absolutely disappears from the scene. Paul's doctrine of a preëxistent

[1] 3 : 16 ; cf. Rom. 5 : 8 ; 2 Cor. 9 : 15, etc.
[2] 3 : 14 ; 12 : 32 ; cf. Rom. 3 : 25.
[3] 3 : 3 ; cf. Rom. 6 : 4 ff. ; Tit. 3 : 5.
[4] 4 : 10–14 ; cf. Rom. 8 : 10 f.
[5] See below on the dependence of Jn. 11 : 2 ; 12 : 3 on Lk. 7 : 38, itself dependent on Luke's special source *combined* with elements from Mk. 14 : 3.

choice on the part of the Son to come into the world and assume the rôle of Redeemer,[1] having been adopted as a persistent consciousness in the mind of Jesus,[2] there remains no room for the vision in his earthly life. Messiah's call is in the preëxistent eternity. Consequently, the story of the baptismal vision cannot be connected with Jesus, but it is vouchsafed to the Baptist.[3] The function of the Baptist himself is subordinated, still further than in the Synoptic Gospels, to his successor; it no longer has any independent significance whatever. The Baptist declares that he comes exclusively for the purpose of making known the Messiah to Israel. This done, his work is at an end and his disciples are referred to Jesus.[4] For these, in turn, there is no long process of preparation by which they are made ready to receive the startling announcement, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God"; but from the very outset the Messiahship is announced to them, and *in its fullest contents.*[5]

The call to the Messiahship and function of the Baptist misconceived.

[1] 2 Cor. 8 : 9; Phil. 2 : 6–8.

[2] 13 : 3 ; 16 : 28 ; 17 : 5.

[3] This extraordinary result, making the Baptist the recipient of the vision whereby Jesus perceived his divine calling, although the nature of the vision is foreign to the Baptist's conceptions, and the effect of it is felt by Jesus, may have been facilitated by the ambiguity of the pronoun in Semitic narrative (cf. Matt. 3 : 16), as conjectured by B. Weiss (*Life of Christ*, Vol. I, p. 324, note), though with inversion of the facts. See my article, "Autobiography of Jesus," in the *Am. Journ. of Theol.*, July, 1898, p. 544 ff. This, however, is only the final stage of the process begun by the Synoptists of reducing the function of the Baptist from independent importance to that of a witness to Jesus personally, and nothing more. Such a complete misconception is especially insupposable on the part of one who had himself followed the Baptist.

[4] 1 : 31–34, 35–37 ; 3 : 26–30.

[5] The attempt to meet the difficulty of the unmistakable novelty of the announcement at Cæsarea Philippi in the

Unhistorical view of the atonement.

A similar blindness to historical conditions and perspective characterises our author's representation of Jesus' approach to the final catastrophe. The hours of witness-bearing are a mere interval to be passed over toward the great hour in which the Son of Man is glorified; the atoning death is anticipated from the beginning. Even John the Baptist preaches the Pauline doctrine in an utterance which no reasonable exegesis can make consonant with his proclamation of the Coming One.[1]

Of the "signs" and other incidents.

The details of the narrative are equally unreal. The typical miracle of Jesus, exorcism, has absolutely disappeared, and the seven signs are, to a great extent, of a different type.[2] The failure of our author to comprehend the material he uses is in some cases clear. The transposition of the cleansing of the temple from its only possible position in the historical nexus, at the point where Jesus is ready, by this symbolic act, to throw down the gauntlet to the religious authorities and openly declare his reformatory purpose, to a place at the beginning of the ministry, cannot be due to correct tradition. The very saying connected with it is inseparable from the

Synoptic story, by urging that Jesus was now recognised as the Messiah "in a higher sense" than before, inverts the relation of Jn. 1:29–34, 36, 45, 48–51 to Matt. 17:16 and parallels.

[1] Jn. 1:29, 36; cf. Lk. 3:7–9, 16 f., and 7:18 f., 23.

[2] Jesus himself places a moral limit on the right of appeal to God for intervention, Matt. 4:3–7; 26:53 f.; Lk. 11:16, 29. The all-prevailing prayer of faith cannot be resorted to against reasonable evidence that the will of God is opposed, Mk. 14:41 f. The Synoptists often fail to appreciate the distinction (contrast Mk. 14:25–33 with 4:5–7), but our author leans even further toward thaumaturgy (contrast 2:1–11 with Matt. 4:3 f., and 11:4–6; cf. 9:3 f. with Lk. 11:29), though the discourses show a higher point of view, 5:30; 6:32.

closing scenes of Jesus' life;[1] and this saying itself is interpreted in a literal and certainly incorrect sense. If we look at the scenes depicted in common by the fourth Gospel and the Synoptists, we find dependence on the part of the former. The multitude no sooner appear in 6:5 than Jesus puts the question to his disciples, "Whence are we to buy bread, that these may eat?" the author overleaping, in the familiarity of the story, the necessary Synoptic explanation that they are faint for lack of food, having been with him three days in the wilderness. Still more striking is the dependence upon Luke and Mark in 12:1–8,[2] already referred to as proving mistaken dependence. In 11:2 knowledge by the reader of the Marcan story is presupposed, but the essential significance of the anointing is lost in 12:1–8, in the effort to make the mode in which the honour is offered more humble. In Mk. 14:3–9 (= Matt. 26:6–13) the motive is consonant with the festal occasion; the woman (in John doubtless correctly identified as Mary) testifies her faith in Jesus' Messiahship by a semi-public anointing,[3] which Jesus, however, mournfully turns from a royal to a funereal sense, to the disgust of Judas (vs. 10). Luke, who discards the story, doubtless as a duplicate of his own[4] of the Repentant Harlot who bathed Jesus' *feet* with her tears and *wiped them with her hair*, inappropriately grafts in the Marcan traits of the alabaster cruse of ointment,[5] and the name Simon,[6] to embellish his own wholly different narrative. But Jn. 12:1–8 *follows*

Faulty dependence on Synoptic story.

Later exaggerations.

[1] Cf. Mk. 14:57 f.; 15:29.

[2] Verse 8 is identical *verbatim et literatim* with Matt. 26:11, and would therefore show use of Matthew also, but the verse is omitted in *Sin. Syr.*, and looks like a scribal loan.

[3] Cf. 1 Sam. 10:1; 16:13.

[4] 7:36–50.

[5] 37*bβ*, 38*bβ*, 46.

[6] 40, 43, 44.

the conflate form, returning to the narrative of Mark, but adding, from Luke, traits which necessarily belong in the story of the Repentant Harlot; for we cannot otherwise account for the statements that Mary anointed Jesus' *feet* (!) and *wiped them with her hair*. The relation of our Gospel to (Matthew?), Mark, and Luke could hardly receive more convincing illustration.

Or granted that thus far we have established but a probability, what candid mind can ignore the flagrant exaggerations of Jn. 18:1–6 in contrast to the mournful simplicity of the Synoptic parallel? Is it not the very essence and pathos of the story of Gethsemane, the heroism of its victory of faith, that no such miraculous intervention came? A rabble of slaves gathered from the high priest's household and hastily equipped with sword, bludgeon, and torch, sufficed to overpower the Son of Man. His frightened followers did *not* obtain their dreamed-of opportunity of seeing a cohort (σπεῖρα) of six hundred Roman soldiers "go backward and fall to the ground" at the mere mention of his name.[1]

Points of historical superiority.

Per contra we should greatly mistake the facts if we undervalued the features of historical tradition which underlie the story of John. The Synoptic tradition tends, as all know, to condense the career of Jesus within the limits of a single ecclesiastical year, culminating at the Passover. It foreshortens his ministry in Samaria, Peræa, and Judæa to a dispro-

[1] The exaggeration is part of a systematic effort to show that Jesus was not, as commonly objected, ignorant of the true character of his betrayer, nor overtaken unawares by a fate he was too weak to resist. A succession of passages evince this design, Jn. 6:64, 70 f.; 13:11, 18 f., 21–30; 2:21, 23–25; 3:14; 4:44; 7:30, 44; 8:20*b*; 10:39. Cf. Wendt, *Johannesev.*, p. 25 f.

portionate brevity as compared with the ministry in Galilee. The fourth Gospel reverses this. If the Galilean ministry is reduced to a bare paragraph or two, that of Samaria, Peræa, and, especially, Judæa, enlarges to inversely corresponding dimensions. The Synoptic chronology, likewise, is expanded in John, and this is in accordance with the facts; for traces are discernible in the Synoptic story itself[1] of the artificiality of the annual system. The fourth Gospel also follows a system connected with the Jewish feasts, but at least it boldly breaks the fast solidifying bond of a false tradition.

Data of Jn. supplement Synoptic tradition.

Not only so, but even before the days of Clement of Alexandria it had been remarked how it supplements the triple tradition with invaluable historical data. In Mk. 1:14 and parallels the story of the Galilean ministry begins abruptly after the imprisonment of John. Of what has gone before we only know that in some more or less remote period of the past, Jesus, at the baptism of John, has received his Messianic call. Why the fishermen of Galilee forsake all to follow the enigmatical summons of an apparent stranger we cannot divine. It is the fourth Gospel which explains the mystery: Jesus is no stranger to these men. They have already served with him in coöperation with the reformatory movement of the Baptist. They have known what it is to catch men. Under his leadership a work like that of John himself had been begun, and withdrawal from it resulted only from his unwillingness to appear a competitor with

[1] Mk. 2:23 (6:39?) implies at least one more Passover season than the evangelist allows. Luke's Peræan ministry is quite too crowded, and demands an interval of several months after the return from Tyre and Sidon, and before the final visit to Capernaum, which may perhaps be dated in March, Matt. 17:24–27.

the great forerunner.[1] John's imprisonment is the connecting link between the two parts of the tradition. Completely as our author misunderstands the Baptist's work and character, the facts he has here to supply are incapable of invention, and testify to the value of his knowledge.

Jn. corrects the Synoptic date of the crucifixion.

A more celebrated instance of discrepancy between the Synoptic and Johannine tradition is that connected with the so-called quarto-deciman controversy. It cannot be through inadvertence that the fourth Gospel represents, in contradiction to the Synoptists, that the death of Jesus took place on the 14th Nisan, simultaneously with the slaughter of the Passover lamb. Its representations are not explicit, but the repeated suggestions of the true date are too clear to conceal the author's purpose of setting right the variant tradition.[2] Much has been made of this contradiction to prove the unhistorical character of this narrative. The facts of the case, when closely scrutinised, would seem to lead rather to the opposite conclusion. The tendency was doubtless strong enough in the early Jewish Christian Church to identify the last meal of Jesus with his disciples with the Passover, whose recurrence continually reminded them of the closing scenes of his life. Yet, if we look at the Synoptic story itself, as distinguished from the evangelists' conception, how little is there to justify such an identification. If this had been in truth the Passover meal, how strange that no allusion is made to its formal rites, so suggestive of comparison with the fate Jesus was about to suffer. If the Passover lamb lay upon the table, why is it that there is no mention of anything but the bread and wine and dish of sauce, and Jesus, for comparison of his own

[1] Jn. 3 : 22–24. [2] 13 : 1, 29 ; 18 : 28 ; 19 : 31.

slaughtered body, uses only the wafer of bread? Why does he, if with desire he had desired to eat that Passover with them before he suffered, not eat of it, but point them only to its fulfilment in the Kingdom of God?[1] We can understand how the simple meal of the night before Passover should soon come in the Church to be identified with the Passover itself. We could not understand the reverse. And let us turn to the oldest and best of all witnesses. The Apostle Paul, writing to the Corinthians at the Passover season, makes a twofold comparison: "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us . . . and is become the first fruits [ἀπαρχή] of them that slept." If the date of Jesus' death was, as John relates, the Friday, *fourteenth* Nisan, on which the lamb was slain, and "the third day," the Sunday of his resurrection, was *sixteenth* Nisan, the day of first fruits, when the ἀπαρχή was offered in the temple, how beautifully appropriate the comparison. How strange that Paul should make it if in reality the ritual acts took place in each case on the day *preceding* the corresponding event in the life of Jesus. In spite of difficulties, we cannot but think the fourth Gospel and the tradition of Asia Minor as to the actual practice of the beloved disciple are the true representatives of historical reality.

In agreement with Paul.

What, then, shall we say of the result, but that it is a mingled one? In both elements of the Johannine tradition, teaching, and story, we have the evidence of superior knowledge conjointly with errors insupposable in an eye-witness. The conclusion we thus foreshadow grows only stronger as we take up the other phenomena of the book.

It would be puerile to proceed at once to the as-

The sources of superior

[1] Lk. 22 : 15 f.

information may not be extricable.

sumption that because a more and a less trustworthy element are present in the discourses and narrative of the fourth Gospel we have nothing to do but to resort to the methods of documentary analysis to reach offhand the solution of the problem. Against all such rough and ready attempts to distinguish an element which we may deem worthy of the Apostle, and another which shall bear all the onus of the mistakes and misunderstandings, the famous comparison of Baur holds true; the Gospel of John is like the seamless coat of the Lord. But even the seamless coat also had a warp and woof and a tasselled fringe, and every historian, including our author, must use materials oral and written, to which his own reflections will be appended. In fact, it can hardly be explained how Tatian and other authors of the second century can have given this material in what appears to be a more original form and order than in John, unless through acquaintance with some of the still surviving sources of the Gospel.[1] Among these were Luke as we have seen, and at least one other of our Synoptic Gospels. But the main source on which the compiler of John, in its present form, has relied is unmistakably the work of the writer of the three Epistles. Both narrative and discourse material bear the peculiar mark of his inimitable genius. Disordered,

The main source of the Gospel.

[1] Thus the story of the Pool of Bethesda, Jn. 5 : 1–9, in the best and most ancient texts, lacks the explanation of the angel troubling the water, vss. 3*b*, 4. If the unanimous verdict of critics is correct, the author of our Gospel never wrote them. But they form an integral part of the story, being presupposed by vss. 3, 7, and agreeing in style. Doubtless the interpolating scribe took them from an extra-canonical source, but that same source must then represent what lay before the author when he cut out the objectionable feature. Cf. the reinstatement of Jn. 7 : 53–8 : 11 in the Ferrariani after Lk. 21 : 38.

interpolated, disconnected from its original sequence, misinterpreted as much of it now is, the mass of our Gospel can be derived from no other hand. But this is as surely to be distinguished from the hand of the author of the Revelation on the one side as from the hand of the compiler and author of the appendix (c. 21) on the other.[1] There is scarcely a paragraph or sentence the author of the Revelation could have written, and whole chapters which are incompatible with his views. Strange indeed would it be, if two works emanating within the same decade from the same small circle should not afford a few specimens of similarity in phraseology and vocabulary;[2] but the minds to which we owe these two productions stand almost at opposite poles of Christian thought. Not in its eschatology alone, but in almost every department the one shows the extreme of Semitic objectivism, crudity, particularism of thought, the other a depth, refinement, and subtlety, a mastery of Hellenistic mysticism worthy of a pupil of Philo.

Testimony of the appendix.

We are told, indeed, by the writer of the appendix that his compilation presents the testimony and writ-

[1] Zahn (*Einl.* § 66, Vol. II, p. 483 ff.), "the prince of conservative scholars," proves conclusively that chapter 21 is really an appendix by another hand, and no one will dispute such an origin for 21 : 24 f. But why limit the work of the final editor to chapter 21? Lightfoot (*Biblical Essays*, p. 194, Additional Note A, "On the Twenty-first Chapter") has shown that we must attribute 21 : 19 to the same hand as 12 : 33. The proper inference is not that the Apostle wrote the correction of current opinion in 21 : 23, which only his own death would naturally prompt, but that the final editor not only wrote an appendix, but retouched, if he did not recast, the gospel. See below. Wendt, *op. cit.*, attempts to extricate the book of discourses, which he attributes to the Apostle John.

[2] Altogether too much is made of these *inter alios* by Reynolds in the article for Hastings' *B. D.*, above referred to.

Three hands distinguishable.

ing of the beloved disciple, and, as we have seen, the conscious authority and superior knowledge evinced would scarcely admit any other explanation, even if we had not in 19:35 the explicit and solemn asseveration that the statement is made on the authority of a still living eye-witness. But 19:35 can only have been written by the author of 20:20 ("his side") and 1 Jn. 5:6; and Jn. 20:20 ff. is surely not from the hand which added the appendix. Hence, we have three to distinguish, (*a*) the witness (ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν, 19:35), (*b*) the original reporter of the Apostle's testimony, (*c*) the compiler of our gospel and author of the appendix. Of these three, when the gospel appeared in the form known to us, the first was certainly dead (21:23), and the second almost certainly; else why should his work be edited by another. Is it reasonable, then, to treat the general statement of the third, in which he lays claim to the highest possible authority for the work he is issuing as "testified and written by the Apostle" (21:24), as if he intended, or were able, to distinguish between such elaborative reproduction of the Apostle's testimony as would be natural to the profound and cultured mind which has given us the Epistles, and ordinary dictation? No; his intention is simply to claim Apostolic authority for the gospel material left by the "Elder," and which he now edits, in the same way that later writers claim it for Mark and Luke, by asserting that they were written (*i.e.* dictated) by Peter and Paul. The editor and the church in whose name he speaks assert their knowledge that the gospel herewith given forth is "the Gospel according to John," as he had testified and as he had caused it to be written;[1] the figure of

[1] If the author of Jn. 21:24 really intends to assert more than that the work of the "Elder" had the approval of the Apostle, it is at least as probable that the attributing to him of

the great-minded "Elder" sinks into the insignificance of a mere amanuensis because the one essential point was to connect the work as closely as possible with the Apostle.

Personality of John *vs.* the Elder, author of the Epistles and main source of Jn.

As to the personality of these two, the Son of Thunder and the nameless Elder of Ephesus, it is only needful to remind the reader that two portraits of the Apostle are current in the Church, differing from one another as widely as the Apocalypse from the other "Johannine" writings. The one is based on the Synoptic writings and Paul[1] and depicts a fiery, zealous partisan,[2] whose salient faults are a self-assertive ambition[3] and a narrow intolerance,[4] which even a score of years after had not disappeared sufficiently to permit the association of John with Paul, rather than with the conservative James, as an Apostle to the circumcision only.[5] The other represents almost the opposite extreme of self-effacement, broad and spiritual-minded universalism. But it is based exclusively upon the Gospel and Epistles *assumed to be*, as reported, the work of John, and takes no account of the contemporary Book of Revelation.

Work of the redactor and author of the appendix.

As for our compiler and author of the appendix, the traces of his work are frequent throughout the Gospel in misunderstandings and disarrangements of the material. Thus, the saying of Jesus in 17:12 is misapplied in 18:9, as 2:19 is misinterpreted in 2:21; and surely a cultured Hebrew would not have taken the familiar figure of the *bath qol* in 12:29 in the literal and concrete sense. Most striking of all the evidence, however, is the strange dislocation of

direct participation in the authorship is a mistaken inference from 19:35, as that he had personal knowledge on the subject.

[1] Gal. 2:1, 10. [2] Mk. 3:17. [3] Mk. 10:35 ff.
[4] Mk. 9:38; Lk. 9:54. [5] Gal. 2:1–10.

material, of which we have instances throughout. Discourses begun in one place to one audience are continued months after in a different situation to a different audience, or to no audience at all, as if no interruption had occurred. Peter begins his denials at the house of Annas around the fire of the servants there, and completes them before another fire at the house of Caiaphas at the conclusion of Jesus' second examination. The discourse of chapter 5 cannot originally have been intended to interrupt the sequence of the Galilean ministry, or to produce the extraordinary transition from the Temple in Jerusalem to "the other side of the Lake of Tiberias." The study of the Johannine chronology long ago revealed to J. P. Norris that its true position is after, not before chapter 6.[1] Not long after Bertling[2] and Wendt,[3] ignorant of Norris's conclusions, proved that the continuation of the discourse in chapter 5 appears in c. 7:15–24.

Displacement of the original order.

In like manner, the farewell discourse reaches not only its final leave-taking, but the actual command, "Arise, let us go hence," in chapter 14. This should be followed by the prayer, chapter 17 (conceived as uttered standing),[4] but is now followed, wholly without connection, by the larger part of the discourse, cc. 15, 16.[5]

A list of displacements of similar character, resting

[1] Article "On the Chronology of St. John V and VI," in *Journal of Philology*, Vol. III, No. 5 (1871).

[2] "Eine Transposition," etc., in *Stud. u. Krit.* for 1880, p. 351 ff.

[3] *Lehre Jesu*, Vol. I, p. 228 ff.

[4] Matt. 6:5; Mk. 11:25; Lk. 18:11, 13.

[5] See my article, "Displacement of John 14," in *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.*, 1894, p. 64 ff.; anticipated by Spitta, *Zur Gesch. u. Litt. des Urchristenthums*, 1893, I, 186 ff.

partly on ancient testimony, partly on conjectures of modern critics, is appended in our note.[1]

Not a vicissitude of transmission, but of composition.

Instances of this kind have led so conservative a critic as Blass to declare, when the discovery of the Sinaitic Syriac had corroborated Spitta's conjecture regarding the displacement of Jn. 18:13–24, that "inverted order is a special feature in the textual condition of John . . . sometimes on a larger scale," and to refer to Wendt's conjecture removing 7:15–24 to the end of chapter 5, among others, as "highly probable."[2] But we have not here a textual phenomenon. Had this been due to "carelessness in copying and the leaving out of sentences which were

[1] An article entitled "Tatian's Rearrangement of the Fourth Gospel," giving the original order of the material as conjectured on the basis of Tatian, will soon appear in the *Am. Journ. of Theol.* Here will be found the bibliography of the subject, and the evidence for altering the order. The following order is reached as probably that of the original material: § i. The Ministry in Coöperation with the Baptist [1:1–18], 19–51; [2:1–11], 3:22–4:3 [44]. § ii. The Galilean Ministry [4:46*a*] 2:12; 4:46*b*–54; 6:1–71. § iii. The Period of Exile, and Samaritan Ministry; Jesus at the Feast of Pentecost, 4:4–42 [43]; 5:1–47; *7:15–24;* [4:45]. § iv. The Visit to Jerusalem at the Feast of Tabernacles, 7:1–14, 25–30; 3:1–21; 7:31–36, 45–52, 37–44. § v. The Visit at the Feast of Dedication, *10:22–25, 7*, 8a* [*8b*], *10–18, 26–39; 9:1–10:5, 9*, 19–21; 8:12–59; 10:40–42.* § vi. The Period of Retirement in Ephraim, 11:1–57; 12:20–36*a*, *1–19*, 42–50, 36*b*–41. § vii. The final Passover, 2:13*, 14–22 [23–25*]; 13:1–15 [16], 17–19 [20], 21–35; 15:1–16:33 [13:36–38]; 14:1–31; 17:1–18:13, 24, 14, 15, 19–23, 16–18, 25*b*–40; 19:1–20:31 [21:1–25]. Here the only transpositions made on internal evidence alone are italicised. All others, save in 18:13–25, are made by Tatian, and with not more than one exception for some other than harmonistic reasons. The rearrangement of 18:13–25 is that of *Sin. Syr.* Square brackets enclose material supplied by R.; asterisks indicate working over.

[2] *Philology of the Gospels*, 1898, p. 239.

afterward supplied in the margin and from thence came again into the text, but at the wrong place," our copies would not all have been alike. The occasion goes further back than the diffusion of the book.

The appendix part of a general redaction.

Already we have seen reason to identify the author of this disarrangement of the material of our Gospel with the writer of the appendix (above, p. 269, note [1]). We have now a single additional proof to advance. Is it probable that the writer of the narrative should have told us the story of Peter's base denial and then concluded his work without any reference to Peter's rehabilitation? Did he *forget* to relate the fulfilment of the promise 13: 36*b*? If these, 21: 15–17, 18 f., were appended later, is it not likely that the story of the denial is also an insertion, occasioning as it does the displacements of material in the order of the discourse, — for the prediction of the denial in 13: 36 introduces the displacement of chapter 14, and the story of the denial itself, as we have seen, is so awkwardly introduced in chapter 18 that Blass declares the present order to be "the work of blundering scribes." [1] A closer scrutiny, in fact, of all the displacements will show a remarkable connection with parts which are common to this gospel and the Synoptic tradition. The problem is one far more subtle no doubt than it has yet been conceived to be, and will involve the searching not only of internal evidence, but of the most ancient patristic literature.

In what sense the Gospel is Johannine.

Once more the question of authorship and date for these anonymous historical books turns out to be more complex than at first supposed. Tradition retains only that element of the truth with which it was

[1] As evidence that Jn. 13: 36 f., and 21: 19, 22 are from the same hand, note the peculiar pregnant sense given to ἀκολουθεῖν.

directly concerned. The material here employed has had no such simple history as it assumes in ingenuously attaching to the Gospel the name of the Apostle. Of ancient external evidence we have nothing whatever pointing to the direct authorship of the book by the Apostle; for while the evidence for its existence in Asia Minor, near the beginning of the second century, grows stronger and stronger with each new discovery, each new fact of this kind adds equally to the strength of the argument from silence, that a gospel of such supreme importance should have excited so little attention, and been turned to so little account by men like Papias and Justin Martyr, who, when they quote from Revelation, are careful to declare it the work of the Apostle John. It is not insupposable that even at the age of ninety or upward the fisherman Apostle may have superintended the compilation of this book of his prophecies. But we must appeal to the supernatural to imagine him, at an even greater age, transforming the whole character of his theology and cast of his mind to become the author of the Epistles and Gospel. The very features of style and expression throughout the gospel, however intermingled with individual traits of Palestinean knowledge, are those not of one born to the country, but of one trained in the refinements of Greek education, and who speaks of "the Jews" and "their law" as only a foreign-born Jew would do. But a reasonable interpretation of the tradition leaves us entirely free to exercise our imagination. Johannine authorship was not an expression, for that early day, to be taken in a strictly critical modern sense. That he that had seen had borne witness, and he who had been a disciple of the Apostle had written out the teaching, would be, to our informants, enough to justify the phrase. If such a disciple of the Apostle had been his spokesman

during the years which Jerome speaks of as burdened with the weight of mental and bodily weakness, and had left behind what he possessed of "testimonies" of the Apostle, perhaps embodied in compositions of his own, capable of being put in the form of a gospel, we cannot deem it strange or uncandid that his literary executor (or executors) should give forth the product as the "testimony and writing" of the beloved disciple. At the same time the veiling of his personality, of which so much has been made, would have its simple explanation.

Date of Jn.

Of the late date of the appearance of this gospel, the employment of our Gospel of Luke is already proof, if proof were needed. The last echo of the period when the life and teaching of Jesus were still capable of presentation in an independently conceived form, it constitutes the crowning gift of the churches of Asia to the generation which would depend no longer on "the living and abiding voice," but on written records of the life and teaching of Jesus. Its parting blessing is to "those who have not seen and yet have believed" (20:29). Not only as the last and greatest of the five books of the Johannine Canon does it fitly illustrate the depth and power of Christian thought in Ephesus, its first great theological centre, but it closes the first century with what Christendom has come to recognise as the ripest thought of the apostolic age, in many respects the noblest of all the interpretations of the life and teaching of Jesus.[1]

[1] On the external evidence for the early date of John, see Abbott, Peabody, and Lightfoot, in *The Fourth Gospel*, 1891. On the general problem see, besides works already mentioned, Watkins, *Bampton Lectures*, 1890; Luthardt, *St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel*, 1875; Evans, *St. John the Author of the Fourth Gospel*, 1888; Sanday, *Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel*, 1872, with articles

Summary of results: (1) The named books.

We have reached the end of our inquiry. Our review of criticism and tradition respectively, and our independent investigation have all served only to accentuate the tendency already remarked as characterising the New Testament criticism of our day. Back to second-century tradition; for its testimony will repay another sifting. Back to the New Testament writings themselves and their testimony, direct and indirect, as to their own origin and nature. These are principles which commend themselves as much now in retrospect as in prospect. Of the twenty-seven books of our New Testament Canon sixteen make direct statements, in their own substance, as to their authorship and origin. Of these there is but one whose testimony we are compelled to reject — 2 Peter. Of the thirteen Epistles of Paul, only the three Pastoral Epistles appear to give good cause for dispute, with the tendency on the increase to account for their peculiarities by the recasting and interpolation they have undergone to adapt them to public use, rather than by denial of their claim to be truly, although by no means wholly or unqualifiedly, Pauline. 1 Peter, with all its signs of late date, may be better conceived as written by Silvanus, with the *imprimatur* of the fisherman Apostle, than as even in part a falsification. Yet the possibilities of mutilation at beginning and end are so wide, and the limitations of our knowledge as to "elders" (5:1) who might have written it so narrow, that a positive opinion would be indiscreet. Finally, among the books which themselves contain

by the same in *Expositor Series*, IV, Vols. 4, 5, and in *The Pilot*, April, 1900 — also Matt. Arnold in *God and the Bible*, Chaps. 5, 6; articles by E. Schürer in *Contemporary Review*, 1891; O. Cone, in *New World*, 1893; J. Drummond, in *Am. Journ. of Theol.*, 1897; C. G. Montefiore, in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, Vol. 7; E. D. Burton, in *Bib. World*, 1899.

claims to authorship by some individual, those of the Revelation of John have yet to be invalidated or explained away.

(2) The anonymous books.

The remaining eleven writings, the five historical books, the two letters of "the Elder," and the longer Epistle by the same writer, were doubtless anonymous either from the beginning or soon after. When the Canon-makers began their work James and Jude were provided with a superscription; Hebrews was left to be fathered by tradition upon whom it could. The mere titles, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, 1 John, 2 John, 3 John, as we have seen, represent no element of the text itself, but merely the belief of scribes and copyists, more or less well founded in church tradition, as to the authorship of these writings.

Relative rights of tradition and criticism.

It would be crude indeed to take the few enigmatic words which embody the primeval tradition, whether those of church Fathers, Canon-makers, or scribes, regarding the origin of these eleven anonymous writings, our one datum of external evidence, properly a subject for the most delicate, careful investigation, and set it up as a complete and every way adequate account of the whole matter, to which research can add nothing but categorically to declare it either "true" or "false." Research will prove it both and neither. The names of the writers of Hebrews, James, Jude, and 1, 2, and 3 John will probably remain unknown to us. The names attached by early report to the five historical books represent in each case the first and most important link in the long process, more complicated, if the new evidence constantly developing be believed, than even criticism has yet conceived it, through which the common possession of the Church in the story of Jesus' life and teaching and the story of its own origins came at last, in various important centres, to be embodied in our

four Gospels and Book of Acts. To ask more of ancient tradition than the registration of this first and most important link is to demand more than we have a right to expect. The answer regarding the further phases of this obscure and complicated history must be sought by the indirect evidence of the books themselves, an investigation which to-day is still only at its beginning.

TABLE OF APPROXIMATE DATES

Galatians, Corinth	Spring of 50 A.D.
1 and 2 Thessalonians . .	Spring and Summer of 50 "
2 Cor. 6 : 14–7 : 1 and 1 Corinthians, Ephesus,	Winter of 53–54 "
2 Cor. 10 : 1–13 : 10, Ephesus . .	Summer of 54 "
Fragments in Pastoral Epistles, Troas (?)	Summer of 54 "
2 Corinthians, Macedonia . . .	Autumn of 54 "
Romans, Corinth	February, 55 "
Rom. 16 : 1–23, to Ephesus, from Corinth .	February, 55 "
Ephesians, Colossians and Philemon, Rome .	58–59 "
Philippians and 2 Timothy (additions excepted), Rome,	60 "
Hebrews	75–85 "
1 Peter, Rome	75–85 "
James, Rome (?)	85–90 "
Jude, Proconsular Asia (?)	85–90 "
2 Peter	100–150 "
Mark, Rome	75–80 "
Matthew, Jerusalem (?)	80–90 "
Luke-Acts, Antioch (?)	85–95 "
Revelation, Ephesus	95 "
1, 2, and 3 John, Ephesus	95–100 "
John, Ephesus	100–110 "

INDEX

The page-references in this Index are intended to include footnotes as well as text.

The letters TC refer the reader to the TABLE OF CONTENTS, pp. xi–xv.

Abbot, Ezra, 23.
Abbott, Edwin, 172, 188.
Abbott, T. K., 115, 116, 117.
Acts, Book of, 51. TC. ch. IX.
Acts, Western text of, 69, 214, 217, 220.
Akhmim Ms. of Gospel of Peter, 45, 52.
Alexandrianism in Hebrews, 146.
Alogi rejected Johannine writings, 6.
Ambrosiaster, 96.
Anachronisms in Acts, 216, 225.
Anonymity in O. T. and N. T., 2, 175.
Antichrist, 75, 78, 242.
Antilegomena, *see* Disputed books.
Antioch, Collision at, 65. Place (?) of writing to Galatians, 57.
Apocalypse of John, 52. TC. ch. X.
Apocalyptic ideas in Matt., 211; in Paul, 77, 119.
Apocalyptic writings, 29, 52, 121, 168, 232.
Apocrypha in early Christian canon, 27, 142, 168.
Apollos, 83, 148.
Apostolicity of N. T. Books, 33, 49.
Aquila and Priscilla, 81, 83, 102.
Aramaic original of Matt., 195 f.
Aristo or Aristion (author of Mk. 16: 9–20), 42, 205.
"Assumption of Moses," 120, 168, 171.
Augustine on the Gospels, 7.
Authority in early Church, 27, 34.

Badham, 207, 231.
Balaamites, 169, 241.
Baldensperger, 254.
Barnabas, author (?) of Heb., 33, 147; of 1 Peter, 157. Uncle to John Mark, 204.
Barnabas, pseudo, 36.
Bauer, Bruno, 21.
Baur, F. C., 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 56, 108, 268.
Blass, F., 214, 229, 273, 274.
Bleek, F., 11, 19.
Bousset, W., 232, 235, 239, 244.
Bretschneider, 6, 8.

Cæsarea, place (?) of Paul's writing, 55, 106.
Cainite sect, 170, 245.
Calvin, John, 3, 168.
Canon, formation of, 2, 5. TC. ch. II.
Canon of Catholic Epp., 150.
Captivity, Epp. of, *see* Epistles.

Carlstadt, A. R. B., 3.
Catholic Epp., *see* Epistles.
Christology of Paul, 116, 118; of John, 240.
Church in Paul's conception, 112, 119, 133, 138.
Clemen, C., 22.
Clement of Rome, 28, 31, 33, 35, 134, 147, 151, 157, 161, 164 f.
Clement of Alexandria, 48, 50, 168, 229.
Clementine Homilies and Recognitions, 13, 60, 206.
Colossians, Ep. to. TC. ch. V.
Conybeare and Howson, 23, 56.
Corinthians, Epp. to, TC. ch. IV. Lost ep. to, in 2 Cor. cc. 10–13, 93 f. Factions and scandals among, 87, 89.
Credner, K. A., 9, 10, 19.
Criticism, history of, TC. ch. I.

Dalman, G., 196, 212, 213, 215, 233.
Date of N. T. writings, *see* under titles of the several books.
Date of Nativity, 39; of Crucifixion, 266.
Dates, table of approximate, 279.
Davidson, S., 23, 146.
De Wette, *see* Wette.
Diary of Luke, 211, 215, 228.
Diaspora, 155, 159, 164.
Diatessaron, *see* Tatian.
Dionysius of Alexandria, 232, 240, 248.
Dionysius of Corinth, 31.
Diotrephes, 246.
Displacements in John, 263, 271 f.
Disputed books, 7, 8, 14, 27, 41, 48, 167.
Docetism, 92, 245.
Dods, M., 160, 188, 196.
Dutch and Swiss radical critics, 21.

Editorial work in Fourth Gospel, 269, 274.
Eichhorn, J. G., 7, 8, 19.
Eichthal, d', 22.
Elias, Apocalypse of, 121.
Enoch, Prophecy of, 120, 168, 169, 233.
Ephesians, Ep. to, TC. ch. V.
Ephesus, source of some Pauline Epp., 82; of Johannine writings, 230; fragment addressed (?) to, 101 f.
Epiphanius, 44.
Epistles, use of in early Church, 31, 49; of Paul, TC. chs. III, IV, V, VI; Catholic, TC. ch. VII; of captivity, 55, 106, TC. ch. V; Pastoral, TC. ch. VI.
Eschatology of Paul, 75 f., 133.
Eschatology of Jesus, 133.
Eusebius, 3, 7, 40, 48, 50, 157, 168, 197, 231, 240.
Ewald, H., 19.
External evidence of canonicity, 26.

Farrar, F. W., 56, 172.
Feasts, Jewish in Fourth Gospel, 258, 265.
Fragments incorporated:
in 2 Cor., 94, 95.
in Rom., 101, 104.
in Phil., 125.
in Pastoral Epp., 128, 140.
in Rev., 239.
Friedländer, M., 255.

Galatia, North or South? 58 f.
Galatians, Ep. to, TC. ch. III.
Gallio, 82.
Gieseler, J. K. L., 19.
Gloag, J. R., 23.
Gloel, 22.
Gnosticism, 18, 30, 61, 132, 169, 230, 245, 255.
Godet, 23, 25, 92, 196.
Gospels, uncanonical, 30, 39.
Gospels, the Four, 38, 47. TC. chs. VIII, IX, XI.

Griesbach, J. J., on Gospels, 8.
Guericke, H. E. F., 19.

Hänlein, H. K. A., 6.
Harnack, A., 14, 17, 18, 146, 148, 157, 161, 243.
Haupt, E., 211.
Havet, 22.
Hebrews, Gospel of, 30, 45, 214, 221.
Hebrews, Ep. to, 33, 48, 50, 127. TC. ch. VI.
Hegesippus, 28, 167.
Heresies in N. T. times, 137, 168, 241 f., 245, 254.
Hermas, 29, 38, 47, 53, 159, 165, 169.
Hesse, F. H., 129.
Hilgenfeld, A., 12, 16, 17, 76, 129.
Hofmann, J. C. K., 19.
Horne, T. H., 9.
Holsten, C., 16, 22.
Holtzmann, H. J., 17–22, 28, 91, 117, 129, 141, 146, 180, 196, 253.
Holtzmann, O., 251.
Hug, J. L., 9.

Ignatius, 30, 32, 35, 127.
Inspiration in early Church, 28.
"Interpolations," greater and less, in Luke, 223.
Introduction, history of, TC. ch. I.
Irenæus, 40, 47, 197, 202, 210, 231, 238.

James, Ep. of, 50. TC. ch. VII.
Jerome, 44, 142, 167.
Jew and Gentile in early Church, 100.
Jewish Christianity, 17; in Matt., 202.
Johannine writings, TC. ch. X.
John the Baptist in Fourth Gospel, 254, 261, 262.
John, only one, at Ephesus, 231; a prophet, 236.
John, Gospel of, 30, 32, 48, 49, 50. TC. ch. XI.
John, Epp. of, 50. TC. ch. X.
John, Revelation of, 45, 46, 47. TC. ch. X.
Judaising opponents of Paul, 60, 125, 133.
Judaising leaders in Hebrews, 149.
Judaism, 18, 203.
Jude, Ep. of, 6, 50. TC. ch. VII.
Jülicher, 10, 18, 19, 21, 238.
Justin Martyr, 28, 30, 32, 34, 39, 45, 46, 199, 238, 249.

Keim, T., 196, 229.
Köstlin, J., 202.

Lachmann, K., 19.
Laodiceans, Ep. to, 52, 115.
Latinisms in Mark, 204.
Lightfoot, J. B., 23, 161, 269.
Logia of Matt., 20, 44, 188, 193, 197, 200, 221.
Logia in John, 252, 256, 259.
Logia of Oxyrhynchus, 192.
Loman, A. D., 21, 68.
Lücke, G. C. F., 10.
Luke, Gospel of, 40, 50. TC. chs. VIII, IX.
Lumby, J. R., 23.
Luthardt, E., 19.
Luther, M., 3, 148.

Magi and Star, 39.
Manen, van, 22.
Mangold, W. L., 11, 19.
Marcion, 6, 13, 34, 40, 52, 54 f., 127, 175, 211.
Mark, Gospel of, 20, 43, 48. TC. chs. VIII, IX.
Matthew, 37, 38, 44. TC. chs. VIII, IX.
Mayor, J. B., 160.
McGiffert, A. C., 23, 25, 57, 128, 129, 157, 231.
Meats, question of, 69, 90, 148.

Meyer, E., 55, 106.
Michaelis, J. D., 4, 6, 7, 9, 254.
Muratorian Canon, 3, 43, 50, 127, 134, 211.
Mystery of Christ, in Paul, 119, 133, 138.

Naber, S. A., 21.
Nazarenes' Gospel, 44.
Nero as persecutor, 78, 156.
Nero in Apocalypse, 243.
Nicolaitans, 170.

Oral-tradition theory of Gospels, 178 f., 188 f.
Order of events in Gospels, 189, 205.
Origen on Hebrews, 7.

Paley, Archdeacon, 56.
Papias, 30, 32, 33, 40 f., 153, 189, 231, 238, 249.
Parousia, 74, 172.
Pastoral, *see* Epistles.
Pauline writings, questioned, 6; largely rejected, 16; rehabilitated, 17; in early use, 31 f., 51. TC. chs. III, IV, V, VI.
Paulinism, 18.
Paulus, H. E. G., 19.
Peter, apostle, source of Mark, 43, 49, 176, 189; "Gospel" of, 46; "Memorabilia" of, 30; "Apocalypse" of, 173; "Preaching" of, 61, 198, 214, 221, 225, 227.
1 Peter and 2 Peter, TC. ch. VII.
Pfleiderer, O., 17.
Philemon, Ep. to, TC. ch. V.
Philippians, Ep. to, TC. ch. V.
Pierson, A., 21.
Polycarp, 32, 35, 51, 127.
Polycrates, 51.
Pott, A., 214.
Presbyter. anon., at Ephesus, 271.
Prisca or Priscilla, 81, 102, 148.
Prophecy in N. T., 232.
Proto-gospel theory, 20, 188, 191 f., 224.

Quarto-deciman controversy, 266.
Quotations in the Fathers, 30.

Ramsay, W. M., 56, 57, 59, 94, 156.
Redactor of Luke-Acts, 212, 225.
Renan, E., 11, 22, 56.
Rendall, 142, 148.
Reuss, E., 10, 19, 146, 205.
Revelation, *see* John.
Réville, MM., 22.
Rhees, Rush, 56.
Ritschl, A., 14, 146.
Rome, protector and persecutor of the Church, 78, 156, 242–3.
Romans, Ep. to, TC. ch. IV.
Rushbrooke, W. G., 177, 188.

Sabatier, 22, 56.
Salmon, G., 23, 172, 176, 196.
Salmond, S. D. F., 24.
Sanday and Headlam, 154.
Schaff, Philip, 23.
Schleiermacher, F. D. E., 6, 8, 9, 19.
Schmidt, J. E. C., 6.
Schools of criticism, 19, 21, 22.
Schürer, E., 146.
Schwegler, A., 12, 13.
"Scripture" in early Church, 27, 35 f., 46, 148.
Semler, J. S., 4.
Serapion of Antioch, 46.
Silvanus, author (?) of 1 Peter, 155; author (?) of "We document," 271.
Simon, Richard, 3.
Sinaitic Syriac version of Gospels, 46, 273.
Soden, von, 141, 146, 170.
Sosthenes, 82.
Soter, Bishop of Rome, 31, 161.
Speeches, in Acts, 226, 228.
Speeches, in John, 257.

Spitta, F., 76, 163, 170, 273.
Steck, R., 22, 68.
Strauss, D. F., 11, 20.
"Supernatural Religion," 17, 23.
Synoptic problem, vi, 7, 8, 17, 19, 24. TC. chs. VIII, IX.
Synoptic tradition discrepant from Johannine, 266.

Tatian's Diatessaron, 46, 273.
"Teaching of the Twelve" (= Didache), 29, 37, 138, 169, 199.
"Tendencies" in apostolic age, 13, 14.
Tertullian, 33, 48, 147.
Theophilus of Antioch, 30.
THESSALONIANS, 1 and 2, Epp. to, TC. ch. III.
TIMOTHY, 1 and 2, Epp. to, TC. ch. VI.
TITUS, Ep. to, TC. ch. VI.
Tradition, growth of, TC. ch. II; return to, 18, 32.
Tübingen school, vi, vii, 11–17, 207, 241.
Two-document theory of Gospels, 181, 194.

Uncanonical writings in early Church, 36.
Urevangelium, *see* Proto-gospel.

Variations among Gospels, 191.
Vincent, M. R., 25, 212.
Vision, a Hebraistic literary device, 215, 226.
Volkmar, G., 17, 146.
Völter, D., 22.

"We document," *see* Diary.
Weiss, B., 24–27, 87, 154, 196, 201, 214, 229, 261.
Weiss, J., 218.
Weisse, C. H., 20.
Weizsäcker, C., 15, 17, 25.
Wendt, H. H., 252, 269, 273.
Westcott, Bishop B. F., 176, 188, 196.
Westcott and Hort, 203.
Wette, W. M. L. de, 7–9, 19.
Wetzel, 179.
Wilke, 20.
Wordsworth, Bishop C., 160.
Wright, A., 177, 180, 186, 188.

Zahn, Theodor, 22, 24, 57, 146, 155, 196, 244, 269.
Zeller, E., 12, 13.

New Testament Handbooks

EDITED BY

SHAILER MATHEWS

Professor of New Testament History and Interpretation, University of Chicago

Arrangements are made for the following volumes, and the publishers will, on request, send notice of the issue of each volume as it appears and each descriptive circular sent out later; such requests for information should state whether address is permanent or not: —

The History of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament

Prof. MARVIN R. VINCENT, Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Union Theological Seminary. [*Now ready.*

Professor Vincent's contributions to the study of the New Testament rank him among the first American exegetes. His most recent publication is "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon" (*International Critical Commentary*), which was preceded by a "Students' New Testament Handbook," "Word Studies in the New Testament," and others.

The History of the Higher Criticism of the New Testament

Prof. HENRY S. NASH, Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Cambridge Divinity School. [*Now ready.*

Of Professor Nash's "Genesis of the Social Conscience," *The Outlook* said: "The results of Professor Nash's ripe thought are presented in a luminous, compact, and often epigrammatic style. The treatment is at once masterful and helpful, and the book ought to be a quickening influence of the highest kind; it surely will establish the fame of its author as a profound thinker, one from whom we have a right to expect future inspiration of a kindred sort."

Introduction to the Books of the New Testament

Prof. B. WISNER BACON, Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Yale University. [*Now ready.*

Professor Bacon's works in the field of Old Testament criticism include "The Triple Tradition of Exodus," and "The Genesis of Genesis," a study of the documentary sources of the books of Moses. In the field of New Testament study he has published a number of brilliant papers, the most recent of which is "The Autobiography of Jesus," in the *American Journal of Theology*.

The History of New Testament Times in Palestine

Prof. SHAILER MATHEWS, Professor of New Testament History and Interpretation, The University of Chicago. [*Now ready.*

The Congregationalist says of Prof. Shailer Mathews's recent work, "The Social Teaching of Jesus": "Re-reading deepens the impression that the author is scholarly, devout, awake to all modern thought, and yet conservative and pre-eminently sane. If, after reading the chapters dealing with Jesus' attitude toward man, society, the family, the state, and wealth, the reader will not agree with us in this opinion, we greatly err as prophets."

The Life of Paul

Prof. RUSH RHEES, President of the University of Rochester.

Professor Rhees is well known from his series of "Inductive Lessons" contributed to the *Sunday School Times*. His "Outline of the Life of Paul," privately printed, has had a flattering reception from New Testament scholars.

The History of the Apostolic Age

Dr. C. W. VOTAW, Instructor in New Testament Literature, The University of Chicago.

Of Dr. Votaw's "Inductive Study of the Founding of the Christian Church," *Modern Church*, Edinburgh, says: "No fuller analysis of the later books of the New Testament could be desired, and no better programme could be offered for their study, than that afforded in the scheme of fifty lessons on the *Founding of the Christian Church*, by Clyde W. Votaw. It is well adapted alike for practical and more scholarly students of the Bible."

The Teaching of Jesus

Prof. GEORGE B. STEVENS, Professor of Systematic Theology, Yale University.

Professor Stevens's volumes upon "The Johannine Theology," "The Pauline Theology," as well as his recent volume on "The Theology of the New Testament," have made him probably the most prominent writer on biblical theology in America. His new volume will be among the most important of his works.

The Biblical Theology of the New Testament

Prof. E. P. GOULD, Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, Philadelphia.

Professor Gould's Commentaries on the Gospel of Mark (in the *International Critical Commentary*) and the Epistles to the Corinthians (in the *American Commentary*) are critical and exegetical attempts to supply those elements which are lacking in existing works of the same general aim and scope. [*Now ready.*

The Teaching of Jesus and Modern Social Problems

Prof. FRANCIS G. PEABODY, Professor of Christian Ethics, Harvard University.

Professor Peabody's public lectures, as well as his addresses to the students of Harvard University, touch a wide range of modern problems. The many readers of his "Mornings in the College Chapel" and his published studies upon social and religious topics, will welcome this new work.

The History of Christian Literature until Eusebius

Prof. J. W. PLATNER, Professor of Early Church History, Harvard University.

Professor Platner's work will not only treat the writings of the early Christian writers, but will also treat of the history of the New Testament Canon.

OTHERS TO FOLLOW

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK